THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG TEACHER EXPECTATIONS, TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD THE TAAS, AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Shelley S. Sweatt, B.S., M.Ed

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2000

APPROVED:

Jane B. Huffman, Major Professor
James Laney, Minor Professor
Michael Land, Minor Professor
M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of Education
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Sweatt, Shelley S., The relationship among teacher expectations, teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and student achievement. Doctor of Education (Educational Administration), December 2000, 128 pp., 27 tables, references, 73 titles.

Accountability is a major issue in education and in Texas, the TAAS test is used to indicate performance of students, teachers, campuses, and districts. The stakes are high for students, as performance on this test has determined whether they progress to another grade and whether they will receive a diploma. Most research studies focus on relationships between the teacher and individual students or groups of students, but not classrooms. Expectations and high stakes testing are central within the educational process, and their relationship on student achievement should be investigated, especially since no studies on teacher attitudes toward the TAAS test have been found.

This correlational study measured teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and teacher expectations for students through data collected from a survey. Student achievement information was collected from averaged Texas Learning Index scores for students by classroom over a two year period. The sample consisted of 22 4^{th}, 8^{th}, and 10^{th} grade reading and/or math teachers who had taught in the same Texas mid-sized, rural school district for at least two years.

Frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviation were used to analyze the responses on the survey. A median score distinguished between high/low expectations and between positive/negative attitudes toward the TAAS. The Pearson product-moment

correlation coefficient identified relationships, with levels of significance determined at the .05 level.

From this study, it appears that no relationship exists among teacher expectations for students, teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and student achievement. It appears that teachers support the TAAS and see a relationship between the test and improved student performance, and view the TAAS as nondiscriminatory for race and socioeconomic status. While teacher expectation levels are not the same for all students, most teachers feel responsible for insuring that students learn while they are in the teachers' classrooms, and communicate, via word or action, the expectation that their students can learn at or above grade level.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As Sir Isaac Newton stated, “If I have seen farther than others, it has been by standing on the shoulders of giants.” I would like to express deep gratitude to my major professor, Dr. Jane Huffman, for her unending support. Though the miles may have separated us, her constant contact and positive attitude made those miles disappear. I also thank Dr. James Laney and Dr. Michael Land for being such a supportive committee and making this distance program work. Mrs. Peggy Aull and Mrs. Eve Wiles also made this path easier to travel, as their early guidance and instruction have been instrumental in making this journey possible. I am thankful for my cohort group; I could not have done it without them. Their help, support, advice, and friendship are extremely appreciated. We were pioneers in a new venture and I hope we have blazed the trail for others.

I wish to thank my parents, Adolph and Bobbye Schmitz, for their love, support, and moral guidance throughout my life. My self confidence, work ethic and love of learning is a tribute to their teachings growing up. To Dirk, my brother, for planting the initial seed when we were young. It is still not too late for Drs. Schmitz and Schmitz (Sweatt). Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude and love to my husband, Greg, and daughter, Merrill, for the sacrifices they have made in order to allow me to go back to school. I could not have accomplished this without their love, patience, and encouragement, as well as their belief in me. My success is their success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG TEACHER EXPECTATIONS, TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD THE TAAS, AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Across the nation, decisions about students and schools are made based upon test scores. Placement within a program or class, promotion into the next grade level, and receipt of a high school diploma are major judgements that may depend on a student's score on a test that measures the student's level of knowledge in relation to learning standards (Heubert & Hauser, 1999). By 1997, the Center on Education Policy (1997) reported that 48 states and the District of Columbia were either in the process of establishing or had already established academic standards. Public use of test scores has held educators and students accountable to meet these standards. Heubert and Hauser reported that in the United States, more than half of the states mandated minimum competency testing by the mid-1980s, and eighteen states had test-based requirements for high school diplomas by the mid-1990s. They also reported in addition to student accountability, schools are also held accountable for scores on these tests, with serious repercussions affecting funding and accreditation. More states have required such testing, and in 1997, President Clinton proposed a voluntary national test in math and reading, which elevated testing to the national education forefront. As a result, Congress called on

the National Academy of Sciences to conduct studies on the appropriate nondiscriminatory use of educational testing (Heubert & Hauser).

Politicians cite the need for increased standards and accountability and it appears as though the public agrees. In the 1995 Phi Delta Kappan/Gallup poll, 65 % of the respondents supported the requirement of students to pass standardized tests for grade promotion (Elam & Rose, 1995). According to the 1997 Phi Delta Kappan/Gallup Poll, 67 % of the respondents felt that using standardized national tests to measure academic achievement of students would improve student achievement "quite a lot" (Rose, Gallup & Elam, 1997). This same poll indicated that 57 % of the public favored President Clinton's proposal for the public schools to be held accountable by student scores on achievement tests. In contrast to the public's opinion, only 22 % of teachers favored his proposal (Langdon, 1997). In the 1999 survey, 50 % of the public indicated that standardized tests scores would be effective in rating public schools, while only 15 % of teachers favored this tactic (Langdon, 1999).

In the Report of the National Commission on Testing and Public Policy (1990), the Commission reported that test scores should not be the sole means for making decisions about individuals or institutions, since most tests are imperfect measures of performance. They recommended that different tests be used to inform instruction, evaluate programs, and determine school accountability. Their findings are contrary to current use of testing, which has usually interpreted scores from one test as an indication of both individual and school accountability as well as program evaluation.

Texas has been involved in standardized testing and accountability issues for many years. Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2000) reported that the public schools in Texas are seen as models for equity, progress, and accountability, a far cry from previous ratings that described the state's public schools as rather backward. Since the 1980's, state statutes have required testing the minimum basic skills of public school children in reading, mathematics, and writing. The first of these tests, the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills (TABS), was implemented in 1980 and was followed in 1985 by the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) test (Texas Education Agency [TEA], 1999). In 1990, the Texas Education Code specified that students must pass an exit level test in high school in order to receive a diploma. As a result, the state testing program was revised in 1990, and the current test, the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) test was implemented. This test altered the focus from minimal skills to higher order thinking skills and problem solving, while being a more comprehensive assessment of the state curriculum (TEA).

Every year, children enrolled in the state's public schools in grades three through eight, and in grade ten, are tested on the TAAS. These tests primarily assess reading and math, with additional testing at some grade levels in writing, science, and social studies. The TAAS will change over the next few years, as the 76th Texas Legislature recently passed policies that will increase the testing to include an exit test at grade 11, and a reading and math test at grade 9 (Section 39.023, Texas Education Code, 2000). Dr. Mike Moses, Texas Commissioner of Education during this Legislative session, said:

> The Texas Assessment of Academic Skills test has served us well since 1990, but we have hit the ceiling with that test. It is time to begin working on a fourth generation test that can take our schools and our students into the 21st century ("Moses Announces," 1999, p.5).

The results of these tests impact the ranking of school campuses as well as the district, and are published in local newspapers as well as on the Internet. These tests are considered to be high stakes tests, as they not only affect the fate of the schools, but also the fate of the students. Students who do not pass the TAAS at the end of the school year will not be promoted. According to the Texas Education Code, Section 39.025 (2000), high school students who do not pass the exit level test cannot receive a diploma.

Primary students enrolled in grades kindergarten through grade two take the Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI) in an effort to assess the level of their reading skills, and the results are only used for diagnostic measures in the classroom. Speculation exists that eventually this measurement, or an equivalent, will become another indicator in terms of the evaluation of the effectiveness of the school. The efforts to measure reading ability lead to significant consequences, as students who do not pass the reading portion of the TAAS in the third grade will not be promoted to the fourth grade. Therefore, pressure exists for primary grade teachers to effectively teach reading skills so that student achievement is increased.

Schools and districts can be sanctioned by a lowering of their rating by the state if students do not perform well on these tests. Districts and school campuses are rated as being exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable/low performing, based on the

percentage of students meeting the minimum standards of the test (J. Nelson, personal communication, December 13, 1999). Recently, student reports have been sent to districts by classroom, indicating an increased accountability for teachers, as the results of entire classrooms can be compared.

For some teachers, administering the TAAS test is not an issue since it measures basic skills and their students perform well on the test. They do not espouse that TAAS influences or changes what they teach. Other teachers are fearful of the test and the accountability attached to it, because if their students perform poorly, the teacher can be the focus of negative attention, as their classroom can be identified as the reason scores on the campus are low. If the campus receives a lower rating, the district rating is also affected, and district administrators may become involved in identifying the reasons for lower scores. To prevent poor scores, some teachers teach the TAAS, and teach only the instructional objectives that are included on the TAAS. They provide their students with numerous worksheets and activities that duplicate the style of the TAAS and have a TAAS oriented classroom.

After the TAAS is administered, some classrooms do not engage in new learning. They spend the rest of the year doing the "fun stuff." One superintendent told campus administrators that he "...had better not see movies and videos in use in classrooms as I walk down hallways in the weeks following the TAAS" (W. D. Taylor, personal communication, April 2, 1999). This superintendent has also terminated study trips requested after the TAAS administration and the end of the school year, citing that such trips should be an integral part of instruction and not a reward at the end of the year.

Teachers often save their favorite units for the weeks after the TAAS, especially if these units are not directly tied to the instructional standards. In some cases, however, teachers try to cram neglected subjects into the few weeks remaining after TAAS before the end of school. Social studies has not been tested until the eighth grade on the TAAS, therefore many teachers opt to spend more time prior to the TAAS on math and reading instead of the time allotted to social studies.

Teachers also exhibit different behaviors in the classroom that portray varying degrees of expectation levels in terms of student achievement. The way that a teacher feels toward the ability of a student can greatly impact the academic growth of that student (Brophy, 1983; Cooper & Good, 1983; Cooper & Tom, 1984; Dusek, 1985; Good & Brophy, 1997). In addition, the level of efficacy that a teacher has in terms of his/her ability for effectiveness can also make a difference in academic performance, and can influence student achievement in both positive and negative ways (Brophy & Emerson, 1976; Saks, 1995; Weber & Omotani, 1994).

The attitudes that teachers have toward the TAAS test may influence the types of learning opportunities experienced by their students. If the TAAS serves as the basis for the majority of activities within the curriculum, students may lose valuable opportunities to experience broader- based topics, more complex skills, and deeper understanding of concepts. If these attitudes are mixed with varying expectation levels for students, student achievement may be impacted.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the relationship among teacher expectations, teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and student achievement.

Significance of the Study

From the national and state level to the classroom level, student accountability is becoming a major issue in education (Huebert & Hauser, 1999). With state mandated testing in Texas, student performance on the TAAS is being used to rate districts, campuses, and teachers. Curriculum is changing and teachers are tailoring their instruction so that a major emphasis is placed on the TAAS. Some teachers exhibit an attitude of indifference toward the test, and believe that if they have done a good job throughout the year, their students will perform well on the TAAS. These teachers generally have high expectations of their students. Other teachers are being driven by the TAAS and their expectation level for students may be inhibited by this strict focus. Some content areas that are not tested on the TAAS may not be covered during the school year until after the TAAS is administered. Some teachers have described the situation to the extent that "...if a subject is not on the TAAS, it will not be taught" (S. Carpenter, personal communication, February 16, 2000).

Research in the last 20 years has been collected regarding teacher expectations and their impact on student achievement. Brophy (1983), Cooper and Good (1983), Cooper and Tom (1984), Dusek (1985), and Good and Brophy (1997) reported studies in which the interaction between student and teacher is influenced by the expectations that the teacher develops toward the student. A student tends to fulfill the expectation level

developed by the teacher, regardless of whether the expectation is accurately based on the student's abilities. Teachers have also held tightly to their original expectations for students, which can prevent teachers from noticing changes in students' potential during the year (Cooper & Tom, 1984; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1997). However, the research on teacher attitudes toward high stakes testing is rather limited, and no research on teacher attitudes toward the TAAS test has been found. Because of the importance being placed on the TAAS test, this study determined the existence of relationships among teacher attitude toward the test, teacher expectations for students, and student performance on the TAAS. Most existing research studies focused on the relationship between the teacher and the individual student or groups of students. This study focused on the collective performance of students within individual classrooms. The information from this study enriched the research base in this area, and provided valuable insight into desirable attributes for teachers in terms of student achievement within a classroom.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between teacher expectations for students and student achievement on the TAAS?
2. What is the relationship between teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and student achievement on the TAAS?
3. What is the relationship between teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS?

Research Hypothesis

1. No relationship exists between teacher expectations for students and student achievement on the TAAS.
2. No relationship exists between teacher attitudes towards the TAAS and student achievement on the TAAS.
3. No relationship exists between teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they relate to this study:

accountability - the degree to which a campus or district or classroom is held responsible for showing growth in student achievement.

attitude toward The TAAS - how teachers view the TAAS test. Teachers may perceive the test as threatening in terms of accountability for the classroom level, or they may view the test as simply another assessment that is a normal part of the instructional process.

high stakes testing - tests that have severe consequences for stakeholders based upon student performance on the test. These consequences in this study are student retention in grade level, non issuance of a diploma, and campus and district ratings.

self efficacy - the belief an individual has about his/her ability to perform certain tasks successfully

TAAS - Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

teacher expectations - teacher-made predictions about the future behavior or academic achievement of students, based upon teacher perceptions of the student. For purposes of this study, teacher expectation is defined to include:

high expectations - teacher exhibit the majority of the attributes for expectations measured, with survey scores above the median

low expectations - teachers exhibit fewer than half of the attributes for expectations measured, with survey scores below the median

teacher expectation effects - student outcomes that occur because of the actions that teachers take in response to their own expectations

TLI - Texas Learning Index. This score statistically describes year-to-year and grade-to-grade progress in reading and math for individual students. It does not represent the percentage of correct items. It ranges from 0 to the maximum score possible on a test, and is preceded by a digit representing the grade level. For example, 3-60 indicates Grade 3 and that the student did not meet minimum expectations. The following year, if the same student achieved a 4-75, the TLI would indicate Grade 4 and that the student met minimum expectations. These TLIs would also indicate that the student made more than one year's typical learning progress for one year's instruction. If the TLIs for the same student were 3-68 and 4-68, they would reflect typical learning progress, although the student still did not meet minimum expectations. With a minimum expectation score of 70, the TLI represents an equal amount of achievement at each grade level and at each administration. Additionally, the standard set at the Exit Level is approximately equivalent to the achievement level required to score a 70 on the TLI at all grades. This is

a standard score that represents the performance of a student in relation to the passing standard, and can also reflect whether a student is making progress over time.

Limitations of the Study

This study used both qualitative and quantitative techniques. Surveys on teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and teacher expectations were administered within a rural, mid-sized school district in Texas in which the researcher is employed. The researcher used discretion while conducting the research, and did not allow familiarity with the sample to bias the study. Data was collected from reading and math teachers in the 4th, 8th and 10th grade who have been employed in the district for two consecutive years. The investigator collected longitudinal student data over a two year period for each teacher's classroom to determine average student growth occurring during one year. The findings in this study may or may not be applied to other situations outside of the sample studied.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Texas 76th Legislature extended the basis for student accountability by increasing the number of grade levels at which students will be tested on the standardized state assessment, referred to as the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills or TAAS (Section 39.023, Texas Education Code, 2000). Students must meet the minimum expectations of the TAAS or face summer remediation or retention in grade. No diploma will be issued if a student does not pass the exit level exam. School campuses, as well as districts, are rated by the state according to the percentage of students who meet the minimum expectations for each section of the TAAS. From the individual student to the district as a whole, student performance on the TAAS has a significant impact.

Classroom instruction is tied to student performance, but there are several facets of instruction that are not generally measured in terms of teacher behaviors. Two of these facets include teacher expectations and teacher attitudes. Since the purpose of this study is to determine whether a relationship exists between the expectations that teachers have for their students, the attitudes toward the TAAS that teachers have, and student achievement, it is necessary to establish a general overview of the research in terms of teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward standardized testing.

Many sources of information were used in this review of research. Most searches for information covered the past 20 years, as the bulk of the expectation research occurred in

the mid 1970s through the 1980s. The research on attitudes toward testing was somewhat limited, and searches were conducted over more than 20 years. Data bases such as the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Dissertation Abstracts International provided valuable resources, as did the Handbook of Research and the Encyclopedia of Educational Research. The world wide web provided information on various resources, and several documents provided by the State of Texas were used. Several books provided background information as identified by library archive searches, and the topical search provided by the Phi Delta Kappa organization was extremely helpful in identifying additional resources. In addition to these sources of information, personal contacts with professionals in the educational community were made. The basis for the review of literature was compiled from this comprehensive search.

This review summarizes the research and issues on teacher expectations and teacher attitudes towards standardized or high stakes testing. Several issues are relevant in this investigation, including (a) the role of social-cognitive learning theory and attributional theory in both teacher and student efficacy, (b) how expectations are formed by teachers and how these expectations influence teacher behavior and the way that teachers communicate these expectations to students, (c) how students interpret and internalize perceived differential teacher treatment, (d) how teacher expectancy effect impacts group, class, and school, (e) how teacher efficacy affects expectations, (f) how this information applies to the classroom, and (g) teacher attitudes toward standardized or high stakes testing.

Educational Theory

Learning Theory

Albert Bandura's social-cognitive learning theory addressed certain components that impact efficacy (Gredler,1997). Self-efficacy should not be confused with self concept. Self-efficacy is the belief that an individual has about his or her ability to perform certain tasks successfully, while self concept is a broader awareness that an individual has about themselves. Self-efficacy is important to both students and teachers, as it determines their attitude toward academic pursuits. For students, a high self-efficacy can propel an individual to high performance levels through difficult learning situations. These students assume responsibility for their learning and are confident that they will be successful. Teachers who possess high self-efficacy believe they can teach all of their students to a mastery level. They take full responsibility for the learning in their classrooms and do not use excuses such as student backgrounds to explain poor performance (Brophy & Emerson, 1976).

Weber and Omotani (1994) attributed much of the research on teacher efficacy to the four factors Bandura identified which influence self-efficacy. The first factor is the successful completion of a behavior or mastery experiences. As individuals complete tasks successfully, their confidence level increases towards the task and skills involved. The second factor involves the observation of others demonstrating the task, commonly called vicarious experiences. Peer coaching is an excellent example, as teachers' confidence levels can increase as they are able to observe their colleagues employ successful strategies in classrooms. The third factor is the least effective. It involves

verbal persuasion, or social persuasion, toward initiating or completing an action, such as encouragement from colleagues. The last factor has a negative correlation with efficacy, as it involves emotional arousal, or physiological and emotional states, within the action or behavior. In most cases, strong emotions usually decrease performance level.

Ross (1995) identified self-efficacy in Bandura's theory as the regulatory mechanism responsible for influencing behavior through four processes: cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection. Cognitive processes are evident in the adoption of higher goals by an individual, a strong commitment to these goals, and the expectation that the goals will be reached. Individuals with high self-efficacy take responsibility for the outcomes of their efforts, no matter what factors influenced the outcomes, which is reflective of the motivational process. Highly efficacious individuals cope with negative thoughts that can lower performance, which is an affective process. An example of the selection process can be seen by the degree in which self-efficacy influences an individual's selection of activities and environments that shape the individual's life.

Attribution Theory

In addition to Bandura's learning theory, attribution theory also plays an important role in determining the level at which students can perform. Attribution theory is based on the assumption that the primary motivation of action is one's search for understanding (Gredler, 1997). According to this theory, the complex sources of information about outcomes are referred to as attributions. Perceived causes of prior outcomes determine future behavior. Bernard Weiner identified the components of motivation, which are linked to self-efficacy and the development of self expectations, in his attribution theory

(Gredler). Ability, effort, difficulty of the task, illness or mood, and luck are considered major attributions, while locus of causality, stability, and controllability are associated with the dimensions of motivation. Weiner also asserts that sustained failure in the classroom can have serious psychological consequences for students, as they begin to develop a learned helplessness which can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Actions that teachers use in the classroom can have a direct impact on students' attributional assumptions. Teachers can emphasize the relationship between effort and achievement, which may help prevent students from associating luck with achievement (Cooper & Tom, 1984). Teachers who demand less from low achievers may communicate low expectations or their belief that the students do not possess the ability to perform various assignments (Good, 1987). These teachers may exhibit excessive sympathy for the students, or provide unsolicited assistance that comes across as gratuitous. Students easily identify such actions and begin to believe that the teacher does not think them capable of accomplishing the task at hand, a situation which reinforces the attributions that the students have formed about themselves.

Failure that is attributed to a student's lack of ability is extremely hard for a student to overcome (Alderman, 1990). Increasing students' efficacy can have significant impact on their motivation to learn. A classroom that fosters learning and progress instead of ability increases this motivation, as students interpret errors as a natural part of the learning cycle. This type of classroom provides students with numerous opportunities to learn concepts and to correct their errors, and are comfortable doing so in a risk-free environment.

How Expectations Are Formed By Teachers

Within any classroom, teachers form expectations about the students in the class. These expectations form the basis by which students are treated and addressed. Good (1987) defined teacher expectations as "inferences that teachers make about the future behavior or academic achievement of their students, based on what they know, or think they know, about these students," and teacher expectation effects as "student outcomes that occur because of the actions that teachers take in response to their own expectations" (p.32). Cooper and Good (1983) and Cooper and Tom (1984), identify three types of expectations. The first, estimates of present ability or achievement, are based on present performance of students, with little prediction of future performance. The second, expected improvement, involves teacher prediction of the academic progress possible for a student over a specified length of time. The third, natural discrepancies between teachers and tests, describes the error, either above or below student ability, that a teacher makes in predicting students' abilities.

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) conducted a study, known as the Oak School experiment, in which teachers were given inaccurate data on the students in their rooms. The student records indicated that some of the children had high academic potential, when in reality, they were a diverse group with both high and low abilities. At the end of the study, the children who were labeled as having high academic potential scored higher on a general abilities test than other, equally able, classmates. These findings supported the premise that high teacher expectations affect high student performance. Research in the subsequent 30 years suggests that teachers' expectations affect teacher-student

interaction and student outcomes, although the process appears to be very complex (Brophy, 1983; Cooper & Good, 1983; Cooper & Tom, 1984; Dusek, 1985; Good & Brophy, 1997). Rosenthal and Jacobson hypothesized that teachers form expectations for student performance and the students respond to the behavioral cues of their teachers, resulting in student performance that is shaped by these expectations.

A study conducted by Shupe (1997) illustrates the impact of teacher expectations on students. The study was conducted on a middle school in Florida that had the lowest standardized test scores in the district in 1992-1993. The school received students from nine feeder schools, with 40 % of the students coming in with academic deficiencies. Staff at the school developed an immersion program that placed 75 sixth grade students in a curriculum centered around the basic four core areas, with science and social studies being taught thematically. The daily schedule was not dictated by regimented time allotments to each subject. The teachers decided when to move from subject to subject.

What is important about this study is the attitude of the teachers involved in the project. They did not believe that learners differ by intelligence; they believed it merely took some students longer to learn than others. Shupe (1997) reported that these teachers believed that 95% of their students could reach mastery learning as defined by Bloom's mastery learning concept, if adequate time and appropriate instruction were provided. This meant that teachers would not move on to another concept until 95% of the students mastered the current material. Upon closure of a concept unit, the students were tested, and those students who had mastered the material moved on to enrichment activities on the same topic. The teachers worked with the other students on remediation, until these

students also achieved mastery. The teachers truly believed they were the key to providing the right instruction to enable these slower students to learn the material.

Failure rates at this school dropped from 28% to 7%. Interestingly, the honor roll increased from 22% to 40% each grading period. The school made the largest gains on the California Test of Basic Skills in the district, in addition to showing the highest cumulative gain on a statewide eighth-grade assessment of writing skills of any school. The study purported that the high expectations and belief systems of the teachers at this school were largely responsible for the success of these students.

Teachers usually form expectations about students from a variety of sources. They make these expectations based on their "beliefs" concerning whether or not students can change their ability, whether students will benefit from instruction, by their choices in the level of difficulty of student materials, by the grouping structure for classroom instruction, and whether memorization or interpretation and application of concepts is the mode of learning (Good, 1987). Good stated that these beliefs are quite complex and usually are a response to students' beliefs and behaviors. Some expectations are accurate; others are not. Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, & Gottfredson (1995) stated that teachers overestimate the achievement of high achieving students, underestimate the achievement of low achieving students, and are least able to predict the responses of low achieving students. Babad (1985) identified teachers most likely to have biased expectations as those who are less experienced, prefer the lecture method, and have extreme beliefs that integration of students with limited abilities would either be highly successful or have no affect at all on student achievement. Expectations that are accurate

can lead to normal achievement levels that students would have reached based on their prior progress. However, if expectations are not appropriate, the learning level of such students can be significantly hindered (Good, 1987).

This impact that expectations have on students, referred to as teacher expectation effect, occurs in two types: self-fulfilling prophecy effect and sustaining expectation effect (Cooper & Tom, 1984; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1997). Self-fulfilling prophecy effect results when a teacher sets expectations for a student and the student fulfills the expectation. These are the most powerful effects because they result in significant change in student behavior instead of sustaining students' established patterns. Cooper and Tom believed that severe self-fulfilling prophecy occurs rarely, while mild self-fulfilling prophecies occur more often. The sustaining expectation effect results when teachers base expectations on past behavior and/or performance, to the point of taking such behavior for granted, and are then blind to changes in student potential. Usually occurring with students for whom teachers have made low expectations, this effect allows teachers to continue to treat the student in ways that maintain the teachers' low expectations. Cooper and Tom contended that mild sustaining effects are commonly found in classrooms.

Cooper and Tom (1984) described research findings on expectation effects in a variety of settings. Statistically significant differences supporting the existence of teacher self-fulfilling prophecies were found in 40% of the studies. Of the 340 teachers who participated in the studies, 70% of them showed student achievement effects in the direction that their expectations predicted.

Experiments have shown that expectations can be based on test results, classroom performance on assignments, group placement, conduct in the classroom, physical appearance, race, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, gender, speech characteristics, or various diagnostic or special education labels (Good, 1987; Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, & Gottfredson, 1995). These erroneous or accurate expectations for students can be either high or low. Good attributed the formation of some low expectations to the teacher's inappropriate knowledge of how to respond effectively to students who are having difficulty learning. Raudenbush (1984) found that teachers who were familiar with students had expectations for the students which were more accurate.

Brophy and Good (1970) developed a model describing how teachers form expectations. The model basically states that teachers form expectations for student behavior and achievement early in the year, resulting in differing expectations, which cause the teachers to behave differently toward individual students. This differential treatment of the individual student sends a nonverbal message to students as to how they are expected to perform and behave in the classroom. If the teacher consistently interacts with individuals based on expectation, and students passively accept such interactions, the students' self concepts, achievement motivation, level of aspiration, classroom conduct, and interactions with the teacher will all be affected. The effects support the expectations of the teacher, resulting in the students conforming to the expectations more so than they might have if the expectations were different or not there. This sequence will affect student achievement and other outcomes. Perceived high achievers will come close to their potential, but perceived low achievers will not gain as much as they could have, if

they were taught differently. Good (1987) believed that when all of the elements of this model are present, the self-fulfilling prophecy effect occurs.

Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, & Gottfredson (1995) attributed the expectancy effect model to Rosenthal and Jacobson, as based on their Pygmalion hypothesis. This model consists of three parts: the accuracy of teacher expectations, teachers' behavior based on expectations, and the way that students interpret and internalize teacher expectations and behaviors. Many teachers form expectations about students even before they meet the students. They review school records, which reflect accurate student information, and can usually make correct expectations about the students. After meeting and working with the students, effective teachers can usually change their expectations as more or better information becomes available, which limits the self-fulfilling prophecy effects, although sustaining expectation effects can still be expected (Good, 1987).

Omotani and Omotani (1996) characterized highly effective teachers as those who believe that every student has the potential to learn. No matter what the race, life experiences, interests, family wealth or stability, they do not waiver in their belief. They never use students' less than ideal backgrounds or home life as an excuse for nonperformance. In these classrooms, all students will learn.

How Expectations Influence Teacher Behavior and How Expectations are Communicated to Students

A teacher's behavior is influenced by the expectations he or she holds for students. According to Good (1987), most of the research on teacher expectations involves communication of the expectations. Many behaviors have been identified as being

present when differential treatment occurs for both high and low achievers. Three major studies by Good (1987) and Good and Brophy (1987, 1997) yielded several characteristics about teacher expectation. Teachers do not give feedback to public responses of low achievers, they seat low achievers farther away from the teacher's desk, they interact with low achievers more privately than publicly, and they monitor and structure low achievers' activities more closely. Teachers also grade tests or assignments in a differential manner in which high achievers are given the benefit of the doubt in borderline cases while low achieving students are not, they provide less quality feedback to questions of low achievers, and they tend not to use effective, but time consuming, instructional methods with low achievers when time is limited. Teachers also exhibit less acceptance of and use of low achievers' ideas. Studies by Cooper and Tom (1984), Good (1987), and Good and Brophy (1987, 1997) corroborated the following findings about teacher behavior and expectations: teachers tend to call on low achievers less often to respond to questions and provide less eye contact and other nonverbal communication of attention and responsiveness.

There are several other relevant findings in this area. Teachers tend to wait less time for perceived low achievers to answer (Cooper & Tom, 1984; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good and Brophy, 1987, 1997), give perceived low achievers answers or call on someone else rather than trying to improve the responses to low achievers by giving clues, repeating or rephrasing questions (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good and Brophy, 1987, 1997), and reward inappropriate behavior or incorrect answers by low achievers, more or less as compensation for not being able to perform as

well as high achievers (Dweck & Elliot, 1983; Eccles & Wigfield, 1985; Good, 1987; Good and Brophy, 1987, 1997; Graham, 1984). These teachers are also critical of low achievers more often for failure, as compared to high achievers (Cooper, 1979, 1985; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good and Brophy, 1987,1997).

Additional characteristics have been identified as well. Teachers tend to offer praise more often for high achievers than low achievers (Cooper, 1979, 1985; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1987,1997), they pay less attention to low achievers by interacting with them less frequently (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1987, 1997), and they demand less from low achievers by excessive teacher sympathy or offers of gratuitous, unsolicited help instead of behaviors that should help low achievers meet success criteria (Eccles, J. & Wigfield, A., 1985; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1987,1997; Graham, 1984). These teachers have less friendly interaction with low achievers, including less smiling and fewer other nonverbal indicators of support (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1987, 1997; Cooper, 1979, 1985; Cooper & Tom, 1984), and use drill assignments for students perceived as low achieving (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Phillips, 1994; Good 1987; Good & Brophy 1997).

Good (1987) noted that some of these items have more research support than others. He believed that these behaviors do not indicate teachers are not teaching or are ineffective. He suggested that they be used as guidelines for changing classroom or school environments and by supervisors to analyze behaviors and study effects of teacher behavior on particular students. Omotani and Omotani (1996) identified three variables that effective teachers modify instead of watering down, changing, or adapting

curriculum as they help individual students achieve mastery. The first variable involves varying the time allocated for the learning of the concepts. Since students learn at different rates, effective teachers manage students who are at varying points in the curriculum, instead of requiring that all students be on the same page at the same time. The second variable involves grouping practices. Effective teachers do not maintain fixed groups, as they realize the impact such groupings can have on students, especially those considered to be slower learners. They employ large-group, heterogeneous instruction with individualized assignments, peer assistance and tutoring, and in-class support services. The third and last variable is methodology. Effective teachers know that one size does not fit all; consequently, they use a variety of strategies to meet each students' needs.

Sometimes, teachers' needs to maintain control and predictability in classroom interactions may promote actions toward low achievers that reduce academic achievement for that group. Teachers who are fearful of losing classroom control may choose to ignore low achieving students when they try to respond to general questions, or they may only call on these students in situations in which the responses are brief and can be tightly controlled. In order to maintain control, these teachers may treat low achievers with less warmth than high achievers. They may not praise the contributions of low achievers as strongly as those of high achievers, as they do not want to encourage low achievers to interact more often, increasing the unpredictability of the students. In addition, they may criticize the weak efforts of low achievers as a means of classroom behavior control. Just the difference in teacher warmth to students may significantly alter

motivation, as low achieving students may not believe that there is a relationship between academic effort and achievement (Cooper, 1979, 1985).

Another cause of differential behavior is linked to how busy the teacher is in the classroom. Most teachers have difficulty monitoring their own responses to various students. A third cause may be related to the difficulty in changing original expectations for students. Most teachers interpret interactions and classroom evidence as supportive of their original assessment of the students. A fourth reason may be linked to causality. Some teachers firmly believe that they will increase student achievement, and see failure as a need for more instruction, clarification, and increased opportunities to learn. Teachers who assign blame for failure to learn believe that they should provide less challenge and fewer opportunities to learn. They are more likely to overreact to student failure than teachers who believe they can make a difference. Usually the difference between types of teachers centers around the core belief in the stability of intelligence (Good, 1987). Some teachers believe that students' intelligence is static, while others believe that it can change. Those teachers who see intelligence as fixed tend to blame failure on the child, while teachers who believe intelligence is not fixed tend to blame themselves for a student's failure (Good).

In a study conducted by Goldenburg (1992), a reciprocal relationship between students and teachers showed that such a relationship influences student achievement to the extent that teacher expectation may not have as much influence on achievement as do teacher actions. In this study, two first grade Hispanic girls in the same classroom were studied for a year. The teacher held high expectations for one child, who actually

performed poorly, while holding lower expectations for the other child, who ended the study with high performance levels. The interactions of the teacher with these two students made the difference in their performances. Since she held high expectations for one child, the teacher assumed that this child could do well on her own, which resulted in the teacher's failure to intervene when this child fell behind academically. The teacher believed that the young girl was capable of overcoming the difficulties by herself. The other child in the study received more of the teacher's attention and assistance, even though the teacher held low expectations for this child. This student eventually excelled in the classroom. In this case, the expectancy effect had a direct bearing in the achievement level of these two students, with opposite results than what was originally predicted. Even though the teacher had low expectations for one of the students, she spent more time with this student, which affected the student's self-efficacy. Because she believed the other student more capable, she did not spend as much time with the other student. Her response was contrary to the responses of most teachers involved in the research studies, and illustrates the potential impact a teacher's actions may have in changing the outcome of teacher expectation effect.

Fuchs, Fuchs, and Phillips (1994) conducted a study of classroom expectations, teacher standards, and differential treatment of intact classes. They found that teachers with high standards and strong beliefs about student work habits and classroom behavior promoted higher student achievement and more individualized planning at the classroom level. These teachers appeared to use better instructional methods and to affect student achievement positively, even though they had students of varying intellectual ability.

How Students Interpret and Internalize Differential Teacher Treatment

According to Weinstein (1983, 1985) and Weinstein, Marshall, Brattesani and Middlestadt (1982), students are aware of differences of treatment by the teacher for different individuals in classrooms. Elementary school children see their teachers as projecting higher academic expectations, offering more opportunities and choices for higher achievers, while low achievers get more structured activities, more help from the teacher, and more negative feedback on academic work and classroom conduct. These students also identified where they fit in with the treatment of the teacher. Students said that the teacher "...calls on the smart kids for the right answer...she expects you to know more and won't tell answers" (p.38). Regarding low achieving students, students feel like the teacher calls on them sometimes "...to give them a chance" or "because they goofed off," or "often she doesn't call on them because she knows they don't know the answer" (p. 38).

Weinstein (1976) also identified reading groups as settings in which students perceived differential teacher treatment. Teachers favored low reading groups with more praise and less criticism than high groups. Weinstein found the gap in achievement, peer status, and anxiety about school performance between the students in these reading groups increased significantly. The quality of the feedback to the low achievers was found to be different from the feedback for high achievers. Weinstein hypothesized that when high achievers are constantly criticized for their performance, a signal goes out from the teacher that she expects more from them. With fewer criticisms for low achieving students, accompanied by high rates of praise for mediocre work, the teacher

communicates to low performers that mediocre is good enough, and that the teacher does not have as high expectations for them as she does for high achievers.

Morine-Dershimer (1982) reported that students can distinguish between praise that is deserved and praise that is motivational or instructional in nature. Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, and Gottfredson (1995) did not distinguish this perception ability by grade level. They found that even within the primary grades, students can tell differences between teacher expectations for their own performance and the performance of other students in the class.

Student perceptions of differential treatment may mediate the relationship between teacher expectations and student achievement. In classrooms with little or no observed differential treatment, student achievement was predicted by previous measures of achievement, which accounted for 64% to 77% of the variance in achievement (Brattesani, Weinstein, & Marshall, 1984). This means that students, in relation to their classmates, continued to perform at about the same levels that they had been performing. In classrooms with high differential treatment, Brattesani, et al. found student achievement was less effectively predicted by prior achievement, which accounted for only 47% to 62% of the variance. Teachers' expectations explained an additional 9 to 18% of variance in student achievement as compared to 1 to 4 % of achievement variance in low-differentiation classrooms (Brattesani, et al.).

According to Cooper (1979, 1985), low achievers' good efforts may go unnoticed in these classrooms with differential treatment, while poor efforts are recognized as the teacher interacts or criticizes the efforts in an attempt to control the behavior of the low

achievers. High achievers begin to see that their efforts pay off, but low achievers have difficulty seeing the relationship between effort and outcome. Theoretically, this should lead to reduction in achievement motivation for low achievers, which would indirectly cause a decrease in achievement.

Good (1987) cited studies by Dweck & Elliot (1983), Eccles & Wigfield (1985), and Graham (1984) in which teacher expectation effects were mediated by teachers' influences on students' attributional thinking, i.e. their thoughts about the reasons for their successes and failures. Low achievers fell into a failure syndrome/learned helplessness pattern, as they believed that they could not do the work because they were dumb. The students believed that their successes were caused by luck, while failures were the result of the lack of ability rather than lack of effort or the reliance on ineffective strategies. Over time, these students came to believe that they could do nothing that would allow them to succeed, so they quit trying. The researchers attributed the reinforcement of this belief by students to the indirect actions of teachers, as they minimize demands on students, overreact to minor successes, treat failures as if they were successes, and respond to failures with pity or excessive sympathy instead of problem identification and remedial instruction. Peterson and Barger (1984) also show that teachers attribute the success of high achievers to ability, while the success of perceived low achievers is attributed to luck. This attitude makes it difficult for teachers to change their expectations for low achieving students.

How Teacher Expectation Effect Impacts Group, Class, and School

In understanding teacher expectation effect, the following shows how student outcomes are affected in groupings within the classroom, as a classroom and in school settings by the actions of teachers in response to the expectations that the teachers have formed. Weinstein (1976) found that reading group membership information contributed 25% to variance in mid-year reading achievement that could be predicted beyond readiness scores from the beginning of the year. High reading groups experienced accelerated achievement rates, while low groups had a much slower achievement rate than what was expected due to variation in readiness. Weinstein offered several possible explanations. He stated that good groups tend to get longer reading assignments, have more time to discuss stories, and are more demanding than low groups. Teachers tend to interrupt low group students more often when they make reading mistakes, giving them the word or prompt with graphemic cues instead of offering semantic and syntactic cues that would help the lower students figure the word out from its context. In addition, teachers do not ask higher-level, comprehension questions with the low groups. Also, low groups usually receive less exciting instruction, have less emphasis on meaning and conceptualization, and more time on rote drill and practice activities.

The Commission on Reading (1984) summarized the problem for low achieving students. These students are involved in reading words more often from lists or flashcards than within context or within stories and teachers tend to ask them factual questions that do not require reasoning. Other studies have had similar results. Grant & Rothenberg (1986) conducted a study of first and second grade reading groups, and found that students in higher groups had more opportunities to demonstrate competence, their work

and task environments were conducive to learning more academic skills, and they had greater opportunities to practice self directed learning. Allington (1983) found that a focus on oral or silent reading forces a teacher to behave in particular ways. Lower groups tend to experience more oral reading, with emphasis on correct pronunciation and proper word sequence. Higher groups tended to experience more silent reading, with the teacher asking questions leading to text meaning and student understanding.

In terms of class effects, Good (1987) and Good and Brophy (1997) found that most formal research concerning student achievement by class or group has been ignored, but predicted the relationship would probably be the same as for expectations and behavior toward individual students. In this respect, Oakes (1985) found that major differences exist between high- and low-track classrooms. These differences contributed to the quality of knowledge, the amount of time assigned to learning, the amount of high-quality teaching, and intellectual stimulation from peers. She found that 35% of heterogeneous classes were more like high-track than average or low-track classes; 36% of heterogeneous classes were like average-track classes (total of 71%). She also found that teacher-student relationships were comparable in 46% of high-track classes, 37% of average classes, and only 17% in lower-track classes. In 83% of the comparisons, slower students experienced positive and supportive interactions with teachers when in mixed ability classrooms. Beckerman and Good (1981) found mixed ability grouping works in a classroom when high achieving students establish a climate that encourages learning. Cooper and Tom (1984) found that expectation effects are more likely found in content areas that allow the greatest variation in instructional styles. Good and Brophy (1997)

identified classrooms that have uniform goals, a narrow range of activity structures, norm-referenced achievement standards, a competitive atmosphere, public performance evaluation, an emphasis on achievement instead of effort, and differential treatment of high and low achievers as classrooms with the greatest potential for expectation effects.

High expectations and a commitment for increasing student achievement are a part of the beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral patterns that exist in successful schools (Brophy, 1986; Good & Brophy,

1997). Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbacker (1979) found that teachers in effective schools set goals that were minimally acceptable, which allowed them to act on their expectations for students. These teachers were challenged by student failures, which meant that they required students to redo work that was not acceptable, instead of overlooking the assignment or sending the students out for remediation elsewhere. They responded in class to mistakes and failures with appropriate feedback and reinstruction instead of lowering standards or using inappropriate praise.

How Teacher Efficacy Affects Expectations

Teachers that consistently respond to students positively, regardless of the expectations they have for the students, believe that they can assist students in the learning process. Brophy and Emerson (1976) determined that successful teachers believed that their students could master curriculum objectives and that they as teachers could meet the instructional needs of their students. These teachers supplemented classroom material when needed, including evaluation methods if existing materials did

not seem to meet the needs of the students. Ross (1995) defined this belief as teacher efficacy.

Ashton (1985) measured teachers' sense of efficacy by their response to the following statements. The first stated that teachers really can't do much because most of a students' motivation and performance depends upon his or her own environment. The second stated that if a teacher tried really hard, he or she could get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students. High efficacy teachers rejected the first statement and agreed with the second.

High efficacy teachers are more at ease in the classroom, they smile more, provide students with more positive interactions, manage their classrooms more successfully, are less defensive, more accepting of student disagreement and challenges, and more effective in producing student achievement gains. They spend more time teaching curriculum and interacting with students on academic content. Low efficacy teachers expressed lower expectations and focused on rule enforcement and behavior management (Ashton, 1985).

Efficacy can be divided into two main categories, the first of which is teaching efficacy. This label describes the attitude that any teacher's ability to bring about student achievement is limited by external factors surrounding the personal circumstances of the student. The second term, personal efficacy, is the belief that the individual teacher can influence student learning. The degree of success depends on the efficacy of the teacher. High efficacy teachers usually produce high achieving students, as they take responsibility for the learning of their students. If the students do not learn, these teachers

find a more appropriate method of instruction. Conversely, low efficacy teachers usually produce lower achieving students, as they place the responsibility for learning solely on the student (Weber & Omotani, 1994).

Expectation Implications for the Classroom

Much of the research conducted on teacher expectations has occurred within the classroom environment, focusing on the interactions between the teacher and individual students or groups of students. The teacher significantly impacts on the achievement level of the students, therefore implications for the classroom teacher have been identified.

Brophy and Good (1974) and Good and Brophy (1997) identified a reactiveness continuum for teachers. The continuum goes from proactive to reactive to over-reactive. Proactive teachers intuitively determine what is reasonable and appropriate as goals for the class as a whole as well as for individual students. If their goals are realistic, and they possess the needed skills, they will move their students toward fulfilling the expectations associated with their stated goals. Over-reactive teachers set rigid, stereotyped perceptions of their students based on prior records and/or first impressions. These teachers treat students according to their stereotype, and are most likely to have negative expectation effects on their students. Reactive teachers fall in between these two types, and most teachers can be found here. They hold their expectations lightly and adjust them according to new feedback and trends. These teachers have little expectation effect on their students, as they maintain existing differences between high and low achievers.

Brophy (1983) and Good and Brophy (1997) found that the largest expectation effect that teachers have on students is negative, as they set low expectations and therefore get low achievement. There is little evidence that proactive teachers significantly effect the achievement of individual students by setting positive expectations, while there is substantial evidence that over-reactive teachers minimize student achievement by setting low expectations.

Good (1987) found that overall, teachers' reactions to low achievers indicate limited and unsuccessful repertoires of teaching strategies such as more rote memorization and endless seat work. Teachers who tend to be less tolerant of low achievers criticize low achievers more than high achievers, and praise low achievers less than high achievers. Teachers who tend to be excessively sympathetic and protective of low achievers tend to praise marginally correct or incorrect responses of low achievers. Both types of teachers send signals that effort and classroom performance are not related, and tend to stimulate less student thinking. This can contribute, over time, to low achievers developing a passive learning style.

Good and Brophy (1997) identified personal characteristics that are likely to be found in classrooms where differential treatment of students occur. In these classrooms, teachers tend rigidly to maintain expectations, tend to disown the responsibility for mastery learning, view student ability as uniform and fixed with little room for improvement due to instruction and frequently comment on student ability differences. These teachers repress and/or rationalize instructional failures instead of trying to overcome and improve them, and display poor classroom management and instructional

skills. The degree to which these traits exist in any one classroom has a direct bearing on the negative expectation effects that will result in the classroom. The younger the students, the more powerful the effect.

Effective schooling research indicated that teachers in effective schools hold high expectations for students and act in ways that mirror those expectations (Good & Brophy, 1997). These teachers shared ideas and educational materials as they collaborated to bring about improved student performance. Cotton (1995) substantiated these characteristics as well as others in her research synthesis on effective schooling practices. In terms of teacher-student interactions in effective schools, teachers indicate high expectations for student learning in that they (p. 17-18):

1. Set high standards for learning and let students know they are all expected to meet them. They assure that standards are both challenging and attainable.

2. Expect *all* students to perform at a level needed to be successful at the next level of learning; they do not accept that some students will fail.

3. Hold students accountable for completing assignments, turning in work, and participating in classroom discussions.

4. Provide the time, instruction, and encouragement necessary to help lower achievers perform at acceptable levels. This includes giving them learning material as interesting and varied as that provided for other students, and communicating warmth and affection to them.

5. Monitor their own beliefs and behavior to make certain that high expectations are communicated to all students, regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, race, or other

personal characteristics. Teachers avoid unreliable sources of information about students' learning potential, such as the biases of other teachers.

6. Emphasize that different students are good at different things and reinforce this by having them view each other's products and performances.

According to Good (1987), asking questions of low achieving students more often will not improve student achievement unless the quality of questions improves. Increased wait time across the board is not effective, as the type of question asked should determine the amount of wait time and the cues that are needed to prompt a low achiever to find the answer.

From the research, Good and Weinstein (1986) recommended that teachers:

1. Broaden the goals of lessons and activities to include application opportunities as well as practice and mastery of basic content and skills.

2. Pay more attention to students' ideas and interests and encourage students to play a larger role in assessing their own performance.

3. Allow more opportunities for students to participate actively in lessons and use materials in meaningful ways.

4. Improve the quality of questions, using higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy.

5. Focus on the positive aspects of learning by encouraging groups to move toward learning goals.

Gottfredson, Marciniak, Birdseye, and Gottfredson (1995) studied the Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA) Program, which is a model used in classrooms to reduce disparity in educational achievement across race and gender. The

model identified fifteen classroom behaviors that are implied by research to be effective practices. Categorized into three types, the behaviors were monitored and found to be used more often with perceived high achievers. Those behaviors identified as response opportunities include equitable distributions of response opportunities, individual helping, response latency, delving, and higher level questioning. Behaviors identified as feedback include affirmation of correct performance, praise, reasons for praise, listening, and accepting feeling, while behaviors listed as personal regard include proximity, courtesy, personal interest, touching, and desisting.

Weber and Omotani (1994) reported certain attitudes will be present in the classrooms of low efficacy teachers. Low academic standards are held for low achieving students, there is less monitoring of on-task behavior of low achieving students, negative attitudes toward low achieving students are present, negative means are used to manage low achievers, and low achievers are sorted and stratified

Weinstein, Madison, and Kuklinski (1995) suggested that preventive action for increasing student expectations must move beyond teacher-student interactions so that the understanding of the context in which expectations for students, teachers and schooling are embedded can occur. This two year study focused on at-risk ninth graders in an inner city high school. The researchers identified perceived constraints inhibiting change. These constraints were attributed to negative attitudes, negative behaviors and climate, insufficient resources of ability and skill level of students as well as physical classroom conditions, and school policies that supported tracking and prevented innovations. In order to address these perceived obstacles, the teachers began to meet

regularly, and as a group, began to exchange, plan, take action, and evaluate the circumstances that prevented positive change from occurring. With this collaborative effort, obstacles became opportunities, and teachers began to take more ownership in developing alternative strategies, which resulted in more positive expectations. The teachers began to understand that they had a major influence in student learning, and student performance increased. Not only did teacher efficacy and positive teacher expectation effect increase, but the infrastructure necessary to support the collaborative environment was established.

The research on teacher expectations and the impact on student achievement is abundant and the findings are repetitious. Enough evidence has been collected to show support for the importance of examining the expectations that teachers have for the students in their classrooms. The research available regarding teacher attitudes toward standardized testing is not nearly as plentiful.

Teacher Attitudes Toward Standardized or High Stakes Testing

Background on Standardized Testing

According to Alkin (1992), the Stanford Achievement Test, published in 1923, was the first standardized achievement test. The use of such tests has grown, with many states now mandating state produced assessments, and a growing trend toward national testing. As the number of tests being administered has grown, the function has changed, and Alkin identifies the tendency toward centralization of control in testing. In addition, current achievement tests are used for individual measurement, monitoring of groups,

schools or systems, and accountability. Contrary to the original intentions of standardized testing, these tests are now being used to evaluate teacher effectiveness.

The establishment of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) spurred even more of an emphasis on standardized testing (Alkin, 1992), followed by the establishment of Title I programs. Coupled with the minimum competency testing movement of the 1970s and the educational reform movement of the 1980s (Alkin; Shanks, 1991), assessment programs have become frequent measures of accountability. The publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 raised awareness and concerns in terms of the need for improvement within education.

Since then, tests have been used as exit exams for high school students and as determinants for grade level promotion. Obviously, the consequences of these tests are quite severe, with very significant consequences. Alkin (1992) referred to the multiple uses of such state mandated tests, with student performance on the tests serving as the basis for individual improvement of the student, and as an indicator of instructional effectiveness for teachers, schools, and districts.

Issues Associated with High Stakes Testing

Alkin (1992) and Cannell (1987), described two issues associated with state assessment programs. The first issue, corruptibility, or inflation, of test scores refers to the practice of teachers only teaching the objectives that are being tested on the test, to the exclusion of other valuable concepts. With such high stakes associated with these state tests, many teachers feel the pressure to concentrate their instruction on fewer subjects. Test scores that result may be a reflection of the transfer of achievement from

these omitted subject areas to the areas that are being tested. It can also result in teachers being compelled to teach to the test, with repetitious drill and practice on tested areas (Alkin; Cannell; Langenfeld, Thurlow, and Scott, 1997; Shanks, 1991).

The second issue identified by Alkin (1992) concerned the interpretation of the test results. Many states report descriptive results that identify groups of students who may not be performing as well, or identifying particular objectives that are not being adequately addressed. Other states try to use the test scores to make causal links between the scores and the educational programs (Heubert & Hauser, 1999). Danger exists at this level, as decisions can be made that erroneously eliminate programs that are otherwise successful.

Monroe (1988) found that attitudes of elementary teachers toward the TEAMS test as a means of improving student performance were positive. However, no significant relationship existed between these attitudes and student test performance. Fenrow (1975) echoed these findings from a separate study of elementary teachers and their attitudes towards testing and student achievement. Moore (1991) found a relationship between student mathematics computation skills and teachers with high perceptions of pressure to improve standardized math scores. He found no relationship in reading scores. However, he also determined that most teachers "...do not view the testing program as beneficial to their instructional efforts, yet many do utilize the results of the testing" (p. 219). This has resulted in teachers using inappropriate and potentially unethical testing practices.

Some teachers have negative feelings about high stakes tests (Stiegelbauer and Lacey, 1992). They were fearful that they would be evaluated by how successful their

students are on the test, and that the test will drive the curriculum. These feelings create stress for teachers (Shanks, 1991). In addition, teachers usually do not approve of the excessive reading required for the tests and believe that they should have increased support for learning instructional strategies that would help their students score better on the test.

The loss of control of the curriculum is a perception that many teachers have about standardized testing (Shanks, 1991). With a standardized test, the tendency to lecture is predominate, leaving the students as passive learners. According to Shanks, students are frustrated with the learning and the testing. She quoted a fifth grade teacher as commenting:

> So again, it feeds into that attitude shift where learning is identified or equated with performance on a test, it's not equated with the experience, the pleasure, the sharing, the communicating, the, it's not, they don't see that as learning. And I think they become more passive in the process because it's almost as if we are saying to them, "You have to sit there and just receive, receive, receive. Then on appointed days you will give it back." We're not involving them, not as much as we have in the past....We evaluated all of the time, there were other tools of evaluation, not a standardized test, multiple choice or true false. Don't they have enough of that in life without starting it in third grade? (p.17).

When following a standardized curriculum that is matched to the test, teachers rarely deviate from the textbook. In effect, the textbook becomes the curriculum (Shanks, 1991). Creativity decreases, and the major goal of teachers is to cover the entire textbook.

This process provides total control of the curriculum to outsiders and textbook publishers, with little regard to the needs of the children in specific classrooms. With the overwhelming ancillary materials provided to teachers, teachers are becoming less involved in determining the content of what they teach; they are becoming more like learning managers in the classroom.

Some competency tests can have implications for teachers, as classroom results could be used in the evaluation of teachers. In a study by Badger (1984), results showed that high school teachers were relatively neutral in terms of testing being used for teacher evaluation. The teachers involved in this study tended to have the same attitude toward testing as they had toward school policy; if they were neutral or positive in their attitudes toward testing, they were favorable of school policy. Generally, however, the teachers viewed testing as a valid means to measure student achievement.

High stakes testing can have different effects on different students. With all students being held accountable for the same standards, students with disabilities often suffer the most (Langenfeld, Thurlow, & Scott, 1997). They may have difficulty taking the test, or if they are exempt, their curriculum may not be as enriched as other students. The overall effect on all teachers and students can be both positive and negative. Such testing provides a clear mission for schools and their staff, with easily identified goals and objectives for students. In contrast, high stakes tests place tremendous stress on teachers and students, often resulting in a narrowed curriculum, a focus on lower-order skills, less local control of the curriculum, and higher referrals for specialized programs for students with disabilities (Langenfeld, Thurlow, and Scott).

Summary

Since *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968), a wealth of research has accumulated concerning the effects of teacher expectations on students' achievement. This study fostered the expectation research explosion that emerged in the mid 1970s and 1980s. Throughout the research, the findings tend to be repetitious. Most studies focus on the communication of expectations to students by the teacher, and how students interpret the signals sent by teachers regarding expectations. Again, most studies are centered around expectations for individual students and not whole groups or classrooms. The majority of results indicate the existence of a direct correlation between how a teacher sees a student in terms of their ability and the performance level of the student. This is a complex issue, because of the multiple ways in which teachers develop and convey expectations for students. This expectation effect can be positive or negative, depending on the original expectations of the teacher, and the ability of the teacher to be flexible and constantly reevaluate his or her original expectations in relation to more accurate and practical expectations. Teacher and student efficacy are vital components to student achievement and teacher expectation effect. From the literature reviewed, the research indicates that teachers' expectations can and do affect teacher-student interaction and student outcomes.

Accountability for students, teachers, schools, and districts has increased in the United States over the past twenty years. A move toward more standardized assessments that carry high stakes has emerged, and the consequences of this move are not yet known. The research base is not comprehensive regarding this issue, and the general consensus of

most studies is that there is not enough research in this area. One study conducted in 1997 by the National Center on Educational Outcomes cites that the literature search revealed fewer than 30 studies, with only 5 studies focusing on persons with disabilities. Their review canvassed published and unpublished research, state sponsored evaluation and state sponsored research reports. Most studies involved broad uses of testing. Some studies focused on time spent on preparing students for testing, and effects on instruction or curriculum. Very little research dealt with attitudes toward the testing process. No studies on teacher attitudes toward the TAAS test were found.

Two main issues have been identified with state assessment programs. The first is the corruptibility or inflation of test scores, as teachers may be teaching the test objectives to the exclusion of other curriculum or concepts. Achievement scores, therefore, may indicate a shift in achievement from omitted subject areas to the tested areas. This may result in teaching to the test, with repetitious drill and practice on tested areas. The second issue revolves around the interpretation of the test results. It is questionable whether the same test should be used for the individual diagnosis of the student, evaluation of the teacher, campus, and district. Erroneous causal links between scores and educational programs may result from this practice.

The information that is available also reports that high stakes testing may be narrowing the curriculum, decreasing the creative role of the teacher, and placing high levels of stress on both students and teachers. At the same time, however, the testing appears to be providing clear guidance for what should be taught and learned.

Accountability is a major issue in education, especially in the state of Texas. No studies on teacher attitudes toward the TAAS test have been found, and the TAAS is used in Texas to indicate performance of students, teachers, campuses and districts. Most research studies focus on relationships between the teacher and individual students or groups of students, but not classrooms. Since both expectations and high stakes testing are an integral part of the educational process, the relationship of both of these on student achievement should be investigated. This study focused collectively on students within a classroom, and provided valuable insight into desirable attributes for teachers in terms of student achievement within a classroom.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Leedy (1997) defined research as "the systematic process of collecting and analyzing information in order to increase our understanding of the phenomenon with which we are concerned or interested" (p.3). In quantitative research, a choice exists between several methodologies. Since this research examined the degree of the relationships among three variables and not the causal factors involved, the research design chosen for this research was a correlational study. A statistical investigation of the relationships between the variables of teacher expectations, teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and student achievement was conducted. A sample consisting of 4^{th}, 8^{th}, and 10^{th} grade teachers who have taught in a Texas rural mid-size school district for at least two consecutive years was used. The student performance records, in terms of the Texas Learning Index (TLI) scores in reading and/or math, were accumulated for students in these teachers' classrooms. A classroom TLI average was then determined for each teacher spanning the past two years. Teacher attitudes toward the TAAS test were identified from scores on a teacher attitude survey, with the median score used to distinguish positive vs. negative attitudes toward the TAAS. Teacher expectation levels were also identified from scores on a teacher expectation survey, again using the median score to distinguish high vs. low

expectations. These data were compared among the three variables to determine if relationships existed among any of the three variables.

Population

The sample for this study included current 4th, 8th, and 10th grade teachers in a Texas rural, mid-size school district who have taught at their respective grade levels for a minimum of two years, and who also taught reading and/or math. This school district was composed of three elementary schools, one junior high school, one high school, and one alternative high school. For purposes of the study, the alternative high school was not included in the population being surveyed, as 10th grade students are not generally enrolled at the alternative campus. The study involved a sample of 22 teachers who met these qualifications.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire that combines two existing surveys was used. The first section of the questionnaire used a survey developed and validated by Stronge (1984) which measured attitudes of teachers toward competency tests. With permission from Stronge, references in the original survey to the Alabama Minimum Standards and Competencies were altered to refer to the TAAS test. The twenty questions from the original survey have validity, and an internal consistency correlation of .91 was established using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha (Moore, 1988). The second portion of the survey measured teachers' expectations for the students in their classrooms. These questions were selected from survey questions categorized as indicators establishing a climate of high expectations for success from the data bank of the Effective Schools Profiler 9

(ESPS, 1998), which was developed to assist schools in the formation of needs surveys based on Effective Schools Research.

Each half of the survey consisted of twenty questions that used a five point Likert Scale, consisting of the following response choices: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. Values of one through five were assigned to each response choice as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Questions that were negatively stated had inverted points as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = undecided, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. From the scores derived from the sample responses, the median score was determined and used as the mid point between high and low expectation labels, and negative and positive attitude designations. In addition to the 40 questions specifically addressing attitudes and expectations, the survey also contained queries soliciting demographic data from the respondent.

A district level administrator administered the survey to the sample in order to limit any undue influence that the researcher might have inflicted upon the sample. The administrator briefed the sample on the instructions, distributed the survey, collected completed surveys, then returned them to the researcher.

Data Collection

The research data were collected from a survey administered to the teachers identified for the study and from these teachers' students' TLI scores. Student achievement in each teachers' class(es) was determined by calculating the growth of each class based upon these TLI scores. This information was obtained from the district's data

base of the TAAS scores. Demographic information was gathered from the survey regarding age, gender, grade level, and years of teaching experience of the respondents. The survey determined the teachers' attitudes toward the TAAS test and their level of expectations for their students. Responses were statistically analyzed according to frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviations. To determine whether any significant differences in teacher attitude or teacher expectation existed based on the demographic information, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to each demographic category in relation to teacher attitude, teacher expectation, and student achievement. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the strength of the relationship among teacher attitudes, teacher expectations, and student performance.

Data Analysis

Several statistical procedures were used in the analysis of the data. These statistics provided a holistic picture of the sample and some determined whether significant relationships existed between the variables. The frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviation was calculated for the majority of the data. Frequency indicated the number involved in a particular measurement, while percent showed this number relative to the total involved. This information provided a more in-depth understanding of the sample, as percentages can sometimes be misleading if the number of individuals included in the calculation are not provided. The mean was important because it is a measure of central tendency and is considered to be stable for the scores in a group. The standard deviation measured the extent to which the scores in a distribution deviated from their mean.

Combined, mean and standard deviation provided a good description of how the individuals within the sample scored for a particular measure.

The sample was analyzed by frequency and percent according to the pre-established categories within age range, gender, grade level assignment, and years teaching experience. This information provided a broad picture of the sample involved in the study. Demographic data from the respondents was analyzed using frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviation. These statistics provided detailed data about the sample and were used to determine whether the demographic category of the respondents influenced their expectations, attitude toward the TAAS, or student performance.

Teacher attitudes and teacher expectation responses were analyzed by frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviation to determine the distribution of responses. In addition, values assigned to the Likert scale responses were summed and divided by the number of questions that were answered regarding attitudes and expectations to provide individual scores on these variables for the respondents. The median scores for expectations and for attitudes was calculated, and the various teachers' scores were compared against the median to determine those with high expectations and low expectations, and to determine those with positive attitudes and negative attitudes. This allowed each respondent to be rated according to their level of expectation and attitude toward the TAAS.

To test for a significant relationship among teacher expectation and student performance, teacher attitude toward the TAAS and student performance, and teacher expectation and teacher attitude toward the TAAS, the Pearson product-moment

correlation coefficient was used. This statistic indicated the degree of relatedness between the factors being correlated. A perfect correlation would have a correlation coefficient of ± 1.00. As the correlation coefficient moves toward 0.00, the relationship diminishes. A .05 level of significance was used with this coefficient, which means that if the null was rejected at the .05 level, the difference between the observed statistic and the hypothesized value of the parameter was statistically significant at the .05 level. Most research studies use the .05 level of significance, as it signifies that the decision to reject the null hypothesis may be incorrect five percent of the time, or the decision to not reject the hypothesis may be correct 95% of the time.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was also used to determine the degree of relatedness between each demographic category and teacher expectations, teacher attitude toward TAAS, and student achievement. The .05 level of significance was used.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed on the means of teacher expectation scores, teacher attitude scores, and student achievement scores, in relation to the demographic categories determined if significant differences existed between these groupings. The .05 level of significance was used. This procedure was used in order to compare the amount of variance for between-groups in individual scores to the variance within-groups. A high ratio of between-groups variance to within-groups variance would have indicated that there was more difference between the groups in their scores on a particular variable than there was within each group. If this analysis was not significant, additional t tests would not be needed.

A t test was used to determine the level of significance between the upper and lower scores for expectations, attitudes, and student achievement. This result indicated whether there were significant differences in the expectations, attitudes, and student achievement for the sample being measured. A .05 level of significance was used.

Summary

Accountability is a major issue in education and in Texas, the TAAS test is used to indicate performance of students, teachers, campuses and districts. The stakes are high for students, as performance on this test has determined whether they progress from grade to grade, and in high school, it has determined whether they will receive a diploma. No research was found that studied teacher attitudes toward the TAAS test.

Even though expectation research is extensive and findings reveal the significant impact teachers have on students based on teacher expectations for students, no research was found in reference to teacher expectations and student achievement on the TAAS. Student expectations are formed by teachers in a variety of ways, as are the ways that teachers communicate these expectations to students. Students quickly react to cues or ways that teachers communicate their expectations, and can either rise to the expectation, even if the expectation is high or low, and/or develop internal acceptance of perceived ability. This often results in a self-fulfilling prophecy effect and/or a sustaining expectation effect. The expectations that teachers have impact students individually, as a group, as a class, and as a school. Combining the heightened accountability in Texas for student performance, the expectation research findings and the lack of research on

teacher attitudes towards the TAAS, this study was necessary in order to provide valuable information regarding the relationships that may exist among these factors.

This study had three purposes. By surveying 4th, 8th, and 10th grade teachers who teach reading or math and examining the TLI scores of their students, an attempt to determine the relationship among teacher expectation, teacher attitude toward the TAAS, and student performance was studied. The null hypotheses of no relationship existing among teacher expectation and student performance, teacher attitude toward the TAAS and student performance, and teacher expectation and teacher attitude toward the TAAS was tested. Demographic categories of the respondents were examined to determine if such grouping influenced teacher expectation, teacher attitude toward the TAAS, and student performance. If significant relationships existed, information concerning teacher expectations and teacher attitude toward the TAAS might have implications for these teachers. If no significant relationships existed, there might still be implications for classroom application.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This study was designed to determine the relationship among teacher expectations, teacher attitudes toward the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS), and student achievement. In addition, relationships were explored between the demographic data of the teachers involved in the study and these three variables, in order to determine whether these variables differed according to categoric groupings of the sample. Data were collected using a 44 question survey measuring teacher expectations and attitudes toward the TAAS test, in addition to student growth as measured by the Texas Learning Index from the TAAS test. The sample consisted of 4th, 8th, and 10th grade reading and/or math teachers who had taught in the same Texas mid-sized, rural school district for at least two years.

In May of 2000, teachers meeting the criteria for inclusion in the sample were sent a cover letter which invited them to participate in the study. They were asked to attend a meeting in which a district level administrator would explain the study and the extent of involvement for the participants. Of the 28 teachers identified, 22, or 79% attended the meeting and agreed to participate. The administrator assigned each teacher an identification number so that responses were anonymous, provided instructions on how to complete the survey on attitudes and expectations, provided each participant with a survey, and then collected the completed surveys.

The surveys were used to determine demographic information on the sample, the attitudes of the teachers towards the TAAS test, and the expectation levels the teachers had toward their students. The TLI scores were obtained from the school district. Recent student scores from past TAAS tests were provided for students in each of the sample teachers' classrooms, spanning a two year period.

General Information

Demographic information was obtained from the sample group in terms of age range, gender, grade level taught, and number of years of experience as a teacher. The frequencies and range of responses are included in Table 1. The majority of teachers in the sample were between the ages of 50 to 59, were female, taught elementary or high school, and have been teaching between 11 and 20 years.

TABLE 1

Demographics of Sample

	Number	Percent
Age Range		
20 - 29 years	2	9.10
30 - 39 years	4	18.20
40 - 49 years	5	22.70
50 - 59 years	11	50.00
Over 60 years	0	0.00
Total	22	100.00
Gender		
Male	5	22.70
Female	17	77.30
Total	22	100.00
Grade Level Taught		
Fourth	8	36.40
Eighth	5	22.70
Tenth	8	36.40
Missing Information	1	4.50
Total	22	100.00
Teaching Experience		
2 - 5 years	5	22.70
6 - 10 years	3	13.60
11 - 20 years	9	40.90
More than 20 years	5	22.70
Total	22	100.00

Attitude Toward the TAAS Test

The attitudes of teachers toward the TAAS test were measured by responses to statements on the survey. The frequency and percentage were calculated for each response, in addition to the mean and standard deviation. The 20 statements, beginning with statement 5, concerning attitude toward the TAAS test were designed in order to measure the degree of agreement with each statement, with a five point variation ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Table 2 illustrates the response frequency and percentage for each attitude statement on the survey.

Statement 5. I feel that the TAAS is beneficial to the educational process. A large majority of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates a strong belief among the teachers that the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills test is beneficial to the educational process.

Statement 6. In general, I do not feel that more money should be appropriated for teaching the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics as part of a competency program. A majority of respondents disagreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers felt more funding should be allocated for basic skill instruction in reading, writing and math.

Statement 7. I believe too much time is already devoted to teaching the basic competency skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. A strong majority of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers do not believe that enough time is spent on teaching basic skills.

Statement 8. Promotion and high school graduation for all students should be tied to passing TAAS. More teachers disagreed with this statement than agreed, as 45% percent of the teachers disagreed, 23% were undecided, and 27% agreed. One participant did not respond to the statement. This indicates an ambivalence among these teachers concerning graduation and promotion being determined by a passing score on the TAAS.

Statement 9. Increased emphasis on TAAS competency testing will make schools dull and will decrease their effectiveness. More teachers agreed with this statement than disagreed, however 23% were undecided, and 32% disagreed. This indicates an ambivalence among these teachers regarding the effect of increasing the emphasis on TAAS testing in schools.

Statement 10. TAAS testing for promotion and high school graduation is worthwhile, even if it initially results in law suits. Only slightly more teachers (45%) agreed with this statement than disagreed. Twenty-three percent were undecided. With no majority responding positively or negatively, teachers were ambivalent in terms of the worthiness of TAAS for promotion and high school graduation, even if it creates legal action.

Statement 11. There is no relationship between an emphasis on TAAS competency testing and improved student performance. Fifty percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, while 41% agreed or strongly agreed. Ten percent were undecided. The responses to the statement indicate that teachers believe a slight relationship exists between TAAS and improved student performance.

Statement 12. If students knew that they had to pass TAAS competency tests to be promoted and to graduate they would work harder and learn more. A majority of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, while 32% were undecided. This indicates a positive response to students working harder and learning more if they know they must pass TAAS in order to be promoted or to graduate.

Statement 13. Students, in general, do not benefit any more from TAAS which emphasizes basic competency skills than from tests that do not. Slightly more respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement than disagreed or strongly disagreed. However, 27% were undecided. This implies that teachers believe students benefit more from TAAS than from other tests that do not emphasize basic competency skills.

Statement 14. I support TAAS testing even if it means my being named as a defendant in a law suit. Forty-five percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, while twenty-three percent agreed. Twenty-seven percent were undecided. One respondent did not select an answer. This implies that teachers tend to be unsupportive of TAAS to the extent that they would be willing to defend the test in a lawsuit.

Statement 15. I feel that, in general, emphasis on TAAS competency testing on a statewide basis is not warranted. A clear majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This indicates support for the statewide TAAS.

Statement 16. If a student completes twelve years of school and the required courses for graduation, he/she should be awarded a regular diploma regardless of his/her

score on TAAS. Slightly more respondents (45%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement than agreed or strongly agreed (41%). This implies ambivalence towards passing the TAAS in order to receive a diploma.

Statement 17. I feel that, in general, the State Board of Education requirement that students pass TAAS for high school graduation will not improve the basic skills level of students in Texas. A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers do not feel that TAAS, as a requirement for graduation, will improve students' basic skill levels.

Statement 18. I feel that competency-based education programs will improve the reading and/or mathematics skills of a significant number of students in public schools. A strong majority (78%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that teachers are positive about competency-based education programs improving reading and/or math skills for a large portion of students.

Statement 19. I feel that TAAS testing should not be implemented because it is discriminatory toward racial minorities. A strong majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers do not feel that TAAS discriminates against racial minorities.

Statement 20. Basic competency skills should be a part of the curriculum but should not be allocated additional time and funds in relation to other curriculum offerings. A strong majority disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers felt positively about receiving additional funding and time for teaching basic competency skills.

Statement 21. I feel that TAAS testing should not be implemented because it is discriminatory toward students in lower socio-economic categories. A strong majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This implies that teachers do not regard the TAAS as discriminatory toward lower socio-economic students.

Statement 22. I feel that the requirement to pass a competency test for graduation will make high school diplomas on a state-wide basis have more meaning. A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that teachers support competency tests as a requirement for graduation, in order to make diplomas more meaningful.

Statement 23. I feel that, in general, TAAS competency testing is a waste of time and money which could be better used in some other area. A majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This implies support for the TAAS by teachers.

Statement 24. As a teacher I support the TAAS competency testing program in my school for all eligible students. A strong majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies support by individual teachers for TAAS.

The frequency and percent of each response by degree of agreement was recorded in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Responses to Statements 5 - 24 by Degree of Attitude

Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Missing Information		Totals	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No	(%)
5.	4	(18.2)	11	(50.0)	0	(0)	7	(31.8)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
6.	5	(22.7)	2	(9.1)	1	(4.5)	12	(54.5)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
7.	1	(4.5)	3	(13.6)	0	(0)	12	(54.5)	6	(27.3)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
8.	0	(0)	6	(27.3)	5	(22.7)	6	(27.3)	4	(18.2)	1	(4.5)	22	(100.0)
9.	3	(13.6)	7	(31.8)	5	(22.7)	5	(22.7)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
10.	2	(9.1)	8	(36.4)	5	(22.7)	3	(13.6)	4	(18.2)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
11.	2	(9.1)	7	(31.8)	2	(9.1)	9	(40.9)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
12.	1	(4.5)	11	(50.0)	7	(31.8)	3	(13.6)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
13.	1	(4.5)	8	(36.4)	6	(27.3)	6	(27.3)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
14.	0	(0)	5	(22.7)	6	(27.3)	4	(18.2)	6	(27.3)	1	(4.5)	22	(100.0)
15.	2	(9.1)	8	(36.4)	0	(0)	11	(50.0)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
16.	6	(27.3)	3	(13.6)	3	(13.6)	9	(40.9)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)

(table continues)

Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Missing Information		Totals	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No	(%)
17.	6	(27.3)	6	(27.3)	1	(4.5)	9	(40.9)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
18.	4	(18.2)	13	(59.1)	2	(9.1)	3	(13.6)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
19.	1	(4.5)	1	(4.5)	6	(27.3)	8	(36.4)	6	(27.3)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
20.	1	(4.5)	4	(18.2)	3	(13.6)	12	(54.5)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
21.	1	(4.5)	1	(4.5)	5	(22.7)	10	(45.5)	5	(22.7)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
22.	2	(9.1)	11	(50.0)	2	(9.1)	4	(18.2)	3	(13.6)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
23.	5	(22.7)	3	(13.6)	1	(4.5)	11	(50.0)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
24.	5	(22.7)	8	(36.4)	2	(9.1)	4	(18.2)	3	(13.6)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)

Table 3 contains the means and standard deviations to statements 5 - 24. Based on a scale of one to five, with five representing a strongly positive attitude toward the TAAS test and one representing a strongly negative attitude toward the TAAS test, the mean scores are reflected for each statement.

TABLE 3
Means and Standard Deviations to Statements 5 - 24

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Five	3.55	1.14
Six	3.18	1.40
Seven	3.86	1.13
Eight	2.62	1.12
Nine	2.82	1.22
Ten	3.05	1.29
Eleven	3.09	1.23
Twelve	3.45	0.80
Thirteen	2.91	1.02
Fourteen	2.48	1.17
Fifteen	3.05	1.21
Sixteen	2.82	1.37
Seventeen	2.59	1.30
Eighteen	3.82	0.91
Nineteen	3.77	1.07
Twenty	3.45	1.06
Twenty-one	3.77	1.02

(table continues)

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Twenty-two	3.23	1.27
Twenty-three	3.09	1.41
Twenty-four	3.36	1.40

Teacher Expectations For Students

The expectations that teachers had toward their students were measured by responses to statements on the survey. The frequency and percentage were calculated for each response, in addition to the mean and standard deviation. The 20 statements, beginning with statement 25, concerning teachers' expectations for their students, were designed to measure the degree of agreement with each statement, with a five point variation ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Table 4 illustrates the response frequency and percentage for each expectation statement on the survey.

25. Each year, ALL students are expected to learn what is needed in order to be successful at the next level of education. A strong majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates the teachers have a high expectation for students to learn in order to be successful at their next level.

26. I believe in the normal curve distribution of achievement based on ability and therefore do not feel responsible for assuring that all students master basic skills. Eighteen of the twenty-two respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This implies that the teachers feel responsible for making sure that all students master basic skills.

27. I do not believe that all children have the ability to learn and to master academic work. A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that the teachers do not have the same expectations of all students.

28. I expect all students to learn at their own highest level. Almost 91% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates a strong expectation by teachers for students to learn at their highest level.

29. By word and action, I let the child know that he/she can achieve at or above grade level. Almost 96%of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that the teacher communicate high expectations to each student.

30. Not all students are held to the same standards. A strong majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that the teachers had different expectations for different students.

31. Typically, 90-100% of the students are expected to master essential skills. A strong majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that teachers expect a high percentage of students to master essential skills.

32. I know how to make academic progress with all of my students. A strong majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that teachers had confidence in their ability to promote academic progress for each of their students.

33. I feel I am making good academic progress with my students. Ninety-five percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies the

teachers had a strong sense of accomplishment in the progress they are making with their students.

34. The effects on academic achievement of negative influences outside the school cannot be significantly reduced by optimistic teacher expectations. A majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This implies the teachers believed that negative influences outside of school can be reduced by optimistic teacher expectations.

35. Expectations for behavior are clearly communicated to students. A strong majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that the teachers clearly communicate their behavior expectations to their students.

36. Low-income children are less likely to be retained than middle- and high-income children. A majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This implies that the teachers believe low-income children are more likely to be retained in grade level than middle- and high-income children.

37. Students who fail to master basic skills are not generally retained, but should be. A strong majority of teachers agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that the teachers believe students who do not master basic skills should be retained.

38. I do not demand the same amount of work and effort from low- and high-achieving students. A slight majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, although almost 46% agreed or strongly agreed. This implies that teachers

are ambiguous in terms of the amount of work and effort they demand from students with varying achievement level ability.

39. I encourage low-achieving students to elaborate on ideas. All 22 of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that all of the teachers encourage low-achieving students to elaborate on their ideas.

40. I encourage low-achieving students to ask questions and seek teacher assistance. All 22 of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that all of the teachers encourage low-achieving students to ask questions and seek teacher assistance.

41. I spend a different amount of time with low- and high-achieving students. A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This indicates that the teachers spent different amounts of time with students.

42. Some children (other than the mentally handicapped) simply cannot achieve up to the learning levels of their more successful classmates. A strong majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. This implies that teachers believed some children were capable of higher achievement than others.

43. With the exception of the mentally handicapped, all children can learn up to grade level, regardless of family situations or socioeconomic status. A majority of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. This implies that the teachers do not feel that all children can learn up to grade level, and that family situations or socioeconomic status has an influence on their ability to learn.

44. At-risk students should be removed from regular classrooms and placed in homogeneous groups so that their needs can be better addressed. Fifty percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, while almost 22% agreed or strongly agreed. The remaining respondents were undecided. This implies that the teachers are ambiguous concerning the removal of at-risk students from regular classroom into homogeneous groups to better meet their needs.

The frequency and percent of each response by degree of agreement was recorded in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Responses to Statements 25 - 44 by Degree of Attitude

Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Missing Information		Totals	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No	(%)
25.	9	(40.9)	11	(50.0)	0	(0)	1	(4.5)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
26.	0	(0)	4	(18.2)	0	(0)	14	(63.6)	4	(18.2)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
27.	3	(13.6)	11	(50.0)	0	(0)	6	(27.3)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
28.	11	(50.0)	9	(40.9)	1	(4.5)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
29.	5	(22.7)	16	(72.7)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
30.	2	(9.1)	16	(72.7)	3	(13.6)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
31.	4	(18.2)	14	(63.6)	1	(4.5)	2	(9.1)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
32.	5	(22.7)	13	(59.1)	2	(9.1)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
33.	5	(22.7)	16	(72.7)	0	(0)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
34.	3	(13.6)	5	(22.7)	1	(4.5)	12	(54.5)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
35.	13	(59.1)	8	(36.4)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(4.5)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
36.	2	(9.1)	1	(4.5)	3	(13.6)	13	(59.1)	3	(13.6)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)

(table continues)

Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Missing Information		Totals	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No	(%)
37.	5	(22.7)	14	(63.6)	3	(13.6)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
38.	2	(9.1)	8	(36.4)	0	(0)	8	(36.4)	4	(18.2)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
39.	4	(18.2)	18	(81.8)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
40.	8	(36.4)	14	(63.6)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
41.	4	(18.2)	10	(45.5)	2	(9.1)	6	(27.3)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
42.	7	(31.8)	10	(45.5)	3	(13.6)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
43.	1	(4.5)	4	(18.2)	5	(22.7)	9	(40.9)	3	(13.6)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)
44.	5	(22.7)	2	(9.1)	4	(18.2)	9	(40.9)	2	(9.1)	0	(0)	22	(100.0)

Table 5 contains the means and standard deviations to statements 25 - 44. Based on a scale of one to five, with five representing strongly high expectations for students and one representing strongly low expectations for students, the mean scores are reflected for each statement.

TABLE 5

Means and Standard Deviations to Statements 25 - 44

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Twenty-five	4.18	1.01
Twenty-six	3.82	0.96
Twenty-seven	2.68	1.29
Twenty-eight	4.36	0.79
Twenty-nine	4.09	0.81
Thirty	2.14	0.64
Thirty-one	3.82	1.01
Thirty-two	3.95	0.84
Thirty-three	4.14	0.64
Thirty-four	3.14	1.25
Thirty-five	4.45	0.91
Thirty-six	3.64	1.09
Thirty-seven	1.91	0.61
Thirty-eight	3.18	1.37
Thirty-nine	4.18	0.39
Forty	4.36	0.49

(table continues)

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Forty-one	2.45	1.10
Forty-two	2.00	0.93
Forty-three	2.59	1.10
Forty-four	3.05	1.36

Analysis of Data for First Hypothesis

The first purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teacher expectations for students and student achievement on the TAAS. This problem was stated in the null form for analysis. The null hypothesis was expressed as follows: There is no relationship between teacher expectations for students and student achievement on the TAAS.

The data regarding the teacher expectations of the fourth, eighth, and tenth grade teachers were collected by means of a Likert scale. The respondents' scores of expectation could range from a low of 20.0 to a high of 100.0, with the higher score indicating a higher level of expectation. The mean and standard deviation for the data of average teacher expectation scores and the student performance gains as expressed from the Texas Learning Index (TLI) on the TAAS test were calculated. These gains were obtained for students in the classrooms of the respondents over a two year period, requiring the use of TLIs from TAAS tests ranging from 1997 to 2000. A Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated for teacher expectation score and student achievement as measured by TLI. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient r was used to measure the strength of the relationship between the variables. A .05 level of

significance was used as a determination of a significant relationship between teacher expectation score and student performance.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, performed on the means of the teacher expectation scores and the means of the averaged TLI scores, did not show a significant relationship ($r = -.034$, $p > .05$) between the two variables, indicating that there is little linear relationship between the two variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between teacher expectations for students and student achievement on the TAAS is not rejected. Table 6 illustrates the information concerning the Pearson product-moment correlation between the expectations of teachers and student achievement as determined by TAAS test TLI scores.

TABLE 6

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between

Teacher Expectation Scores and TAAS TLI Scores

Variable	N	r	p
Teacher Expectation Score and Student Achievement	22	-.034	.88

The mean and standard deviation of the average teacher expectation scores of the respondents and of the student TLI scores are contained in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Mean and Standard Deviation for

Teacher Expectation and Student TLI Scores

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Teacher Expectation Score	22	68.14	7.77
Student TLI Average by Teacher	22	1.71	1.59

Analysis of Data for Second Hypothesis

The second purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and student achievement on the TAAS. This problem was expressed in the null form for analysis. The null hypothesis was stated as follows: There is no relationship between teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and student achievement on the TAAS.

The data regarding the teacher attitudes toward the TAAS of the fourth, eighth, and tenth grade teachers were collected by means of a Likert scale. The respondents' scores of attitudes toward the TAAS could range from a low of 20.0 to a high of 100.0, with the higher score indicating a more positive attitude toward the TAAS. The mean and standard deviation for the data of average teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and the averaged student performance gains as expressed from the Texas Learning Index (TLI) on the TAAS were calculated. These gains were obtained for students in the classrooms of the respondents over a two year period, requiring the use of TLIs from TAAS tests

ranging from 1997 to 2000. A Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated for teacher attitude toward the TAAS score and student achievement as measured by TLI. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient r was used to measure the strength of the relationship between the variables. A .05 level of significance was used as a determination of a significant relationship between teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and student performance.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, performed on the means of the teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and the means of the averaged TLI scores, did not show a significant relationship ($r = -.183$, $p > .05$) between the two variables, indicating that there is little linear relationship between the two variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and student achievement on the TAAS cannot be rejected. Table 8 illustrates the information concerning the Pearson product-moment correlation between teacher attitude toward the TAAS and student achievement as determined by TAAS test TLI scores.

TABLE 8

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between

Teacher Attitude Toward the TAAS and TAAS TLI Scores

Variable	N	r	p
Teacher Attitude Toward the TAAS and Student Achievement	22	-.183	0.415

The mean and standard deviation of the averaged scores of teacher attitude toward the TAAS and of the student TLI scores are contained in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Mean and Standard Deviation for

Teacher Attitude Toward TAAS

and Student TLI Scores

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Teacher Attitude Score	22	63.41	16.50
Student TLI Average by Teacher	22	1.71	1.59

Analysis of Data for Third Hypothesis

The third purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS. This problem was expressed in the null form for analysis: There is no relationship between teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS.

The data regarding the teacher expectations and attitudes toward the TAAS were collected by means of a Likert scale. The respondents' scores of expectations for students could range from a low of 20.0 to a high of 100.0, with a higher score indicating a higher expectation level. Scores of attitudes toward the TAAS fell within this same range, with the higher score indicating a more positive attitude toward the TAAS. The means and standard deviations for the data of teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes

toward the TAAS were calculated. A Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated for teacher expectations for students and teacher attitude toward the TAAS, and this value (r) was used to measure the strength of the relationship between the variables. A .05 level of significance was used as a determination of a significant relationship between teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, performed on the means of the teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS did not show a significant relationship ($r = .053$, $p > .05$) between the two variables, indicating that there is little linear relationship between the two variables. The null hypothesis, that there is no relationship between teacher expectations for students and student achievement on TAAS cannot be rejected. Table 10 illustrates the information concerning the Pearson product-moment correlation between teacher expectations for students and teacher attitude toward the TAAS.

TABLE 10

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Between Teacher Expectations for Students and Teacher Attitude Toward the TAAS

Variable	N	r	p
Teacher Expectations for Students and Teacher Attitude Toward the TAAS	22	.053	0.815

The mean and standard deviation of the scores of teacher expectations for students and teacher attitude toward the TAAS are contained in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Mean and Standard Deviation for

Teacher Expectations for Students and

Teacher Attitude Toward TAAS

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Teacher Expectations for Students	22	68.14	7.77
Teacher Attitude Score	22	63.41	16.50

Additional Analysis of Data

Because no significant differences were found among the three variables, additional ways to treat and analyze the data were designed in order to obtain as much information as possible from the data. The attitude scores for the respondents were measured on a Likert scale, based on responses to statements about the TAAS test. These responses were assigned a value of one through five as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. These values were inverted for negative statements as follows: 5 = strongly disagree, 4 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 2 = agree, and 1 = strongly agree. These scores were then summed and divided by the number of statements for which responses were given. The respondents' answers reflected either a positive, negative, or undecided position regarding the TAAS test. In

order to determine whether an individual teacher had a positive or negative attitude toward the TAAS, the median individual score for the respondents were determined, and those with scores above the median were considered to exhibit a positive attitude toward the TAAS, and those with scores below the median were considered to exhibit a negative attitude toward the TAAS. The same process was used to determine the teachers' expectations for students. Scores above the median were considered to have high expectations for their students, and those with scores below the median were considered to have low expectations for their students.

A median score of 68.5 from the expectation survey established the divide between high and low expectations for students. The individual teacher scores ranged from 79 to 46, on a 100 point scale. A median score of 67 on the attitude survey established the divide between positive and negative attitudes toward the TAAS. These scores ranged from 88 to 29 on a 100 point scale. Table 12 lists the respondents' individual summed scores and ratings for both level of expectation and attitude toward the TAAS.

TABLE 12

Individual Respondent Rating for Expectations

for Students and Attitude Toward the TAAS

Respondent	Summed Score for Expectation Level for Students	Rating for Expectation Level for Students	Summed Score for Attitude Towards TAAS	Rating for Attitude Toward TAAS
1A	70	High	76	Positive
2A	79	High	67	Neutral
3A	57	Low	55	Negative
4A	73	High	29	Negative
5A	66	Low	74	Positive
6A	68	Low	57	Negative
7A	75	High	81	Positive
8A	79	High	79	Positive
9A	64	Low	37	Negative
12A	73	High	58	Negative
13A	64	Low	67	Neutral
15A	76	High	52	Negative
16A	67	Low	42	Negative
17A	46	Low	74	Positive
19A	68	Low	73	Positive
21B	62	Low	76	Positive
22B	76	High	78	Positive
23B	74	High	88	Positive

(table continues)

Respondent	Summed Score for Expectation Level for Students	Rating for Expectation Level for Students	Summed Score for Attitude Towards TAAS	Rating for Attitude Toward TAAS
24B	64	Low	73	Positive
25B	69	High	32	Negative
28B	69	High	64	Negative
29B	60	Low	63	Negative

The demographic categories of the respondents were analyzed in terms of the ratings for expectation level and attitude toward the TAAS. Individual respondent scores above the median of 68.5 for teacher expectations for students were rated as high expectations, with those scores below 68.5 rated as low expectations for students. Respondents scoring above the median score of 67 for attitude toward the TAAS were rated as positive attitude, and those with scores below 67 rated as negative attitude toward the TAAS.

More females (53%) had higher expectations for students than males, and (47%) of the female respondents possessed positive attitudes toward the TAAS. One female respondent was neutral in terms of positive attitudes. Table 13 indicates the rating for the respondents in terms of expectation level and attitude toward TAAS by gender.

TABLE 13

Ratings of Teacher Expectations for Students and Attitude Toward TAAS Based on Gender

Gender	Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude		High Expectations		Low Expectation	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	2	40	3	60	2	40	3	60
Female	8	47	7	41	9	53	8	47

Two age groups had the highest percent of respondents within the age group scoring positive attitudes. The group ranging from 20 to 29 years and those ranging from 30 to 39 years had 50% of their respondents rating a positive attitude. The 20 to 20 year group had 100% of the group with a high expectation rating, while the age group of 40 to 49 years had the most (80%) exhibiting low expectations. Table 14 contains the data according to age group.

TABLE 14

Ratings of Teacher Expectations for Students

and Attitude Toward TAAS Based on Age Group

Age Group	Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude		High Expectations		Low Expectation	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
20 - 29	1	50	1	50	2	100	0	0
30 - 39	2	50	2	50	3	75	1	25
40 - 49	2	40	2	40	1	20	4	80
50 - 59	5	45	5	45	5	45	6	55
60 +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Fourth grade teachers had the highest percentage of respondents rating as high expectations (63%), while tenth grade teachers had the highest percentage rating as low expectations (63%). Fourth and tenth grade teachers had the highest percentage (50%) of respondents to rate positive attitudes. Table 15 illustrates the ratings according to grade level assignment.

TABLE 15

Ratings of Teacher Expectations for Students

and Attitude Toward TAAS Based on Grade Level Assignment

Grade Level Assignment	Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude		High Expectations		Low Expectation	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4th Grade	4	50	2	25	5	63	3	38
8th Grade	2	40	3	60	2	40	3	60
10th Grade	4	50	4	50	3	38	5	63

Teachers who have been teaching between 11 and 20 years had the largest percentage of respondents within their group to rate both high expectations and positive attitudes. Table 16 illustrates the ratings for teachers based on years of experience in teaching.

TABLE 16

Ratings of Teacher Expectations for Students

and Attitude Toward TAAS Based on Years Teaching Experience

Years Teaching Experience	Positive Attitude		Negative Attitude		High Expectations		Low Expectation	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2 - 5 Years	2	40	3	60	2	40	3	60
6 - 10 Years	1	33	1	33	1	33	2	67
11 - 20 Years	5	56	3	33	6	67	3	33
20 +	2	40	3	60	1	20	4	80

Student achievement was determined by averaging the difference in TLI scores between two subsequent TAAS administrations for students in a respondent's class, over a two year period. These averages represented the average gain in achievement for each respondent's classroom. The averages ranged from -0.418 to 5.596. Table 17 shows the scores for the respondents' individual expectations for students, attitude toward the TAAS, and student achievement as evidenced by average gains in TLI, in descending order based on expectation level.

TABLE 17

Scores for Respondents' Expectations For Students,

Attitude Toward the TAAS, and Student Achievement

Expectation Level	Attitude Toward TAAS	Student Achievement
79	67	1.231
79	79	2.064
76	78	1.200
76	52	-0.172
75	81	3.039
74	88	-0.357
73	29	2.185
73	58	1.674
70	76	0.613
69	32	2.367
69	64	0.376
68	73	0.443
68	57	4.267
67	42	2.581
66	74	-0.300
64	73	2.039
64	67	5.596
64	37	1.040
62	76	2.829

(table continues)

Expectation Level	Attitude Toward TAAS	Student Achievement
60	63	3.917
57	55	1.350
46	74	-0.418

In order to determine whether a significant difference exists between the respondents rated as having high expectations for students and those rated as having low expectations for students, the means between the top six expectation- rated respondents and the last six were compared. A t-test was used for the analysis, showing a significant difference ($t = 6.038$, $p<.05$). Table 18 illustrates the relationship between the teachers with the highest expectations for students and those with the lowest expectations.

TABLE 18

T-Test Between Teachers With Highest Expectations and Teachers With Lowest Expectations

Highest Expectation Scores	Lowest Expectation Scores	df	t
79	64	10	6.038
79	64		
76	62		
76	60		
75	57		
74	46		

In order to determine whether a significant difference exists between the respondents rated as having positive attitudes toward the TAAS and those rated as having negative attitudes toward the TAAS, the means between the top five positive attitude-rated respondents and the bottom five negative attitude-rated respondents were compared. A t-test was used for the analysis, showing a significant difference ($t = 7.713$, $p<.05$). Table 19 illustrates the relationship between the teachers with the most positive attitudes toward the TAAS and those with the most negative attitude toward the TAAS.

TABLE 19

T-Test Between Teachers With Positive Attitudes

and Teachers With Negative Attitudes

Positive Attitude Scores	Negative Attitude Scores	df	t
88	29	8	7.713
81	32		
79	37		
78	42		
76	52		

In order to determine whether a significant difference exists between the respondents identified as having the highest student achievement from gains in TLI scores and those identified as having the lowest student achievement from gains in TLI scores, the means between the top five respondents with the highest student achievement and the bottom five respondents with the lowest student achievement were compared. A t-test was used for the analysis, showing a significant difference ($t = 2.25$, $p<.05$). Table 20 illustrates the relationship between the teachers with the highest student achievement those with the lowest student achievement.

TABLE 20

T-Test Between Teachers With High Student Achievement and Teachers With Low Student Achievement

High Student Achievement Scores	Low Student Achievement Scores	df	t
5.596	-0.418	8	2.25
4.267	-0.357		
3.912	-0.300		
3.039	-0.172		
2.829	0.376		

Another approach to analyzing the data used demographic information as a dependent variable to be correlated with teacher expectations for students, teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and student performance.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, performed on the means of respondent gender scores and the means of the teacher expectations for students, means of teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and means of averaged TLI scores, did not show any significant relationships ($p>.05$) between gender and the three variables. The values of $r = .038$, $r = .000$, and $r = -.255$, respectively, indicated that there is little linear relationship between gender and teacher expectations for students and between gender and student achievement. There was no relationship between gender and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS. Table 21 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-

moment correlation between gender and teacher expectations for students, teacher attitude towards TAAS, and student achievement.

TABLE 21

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient

Between Gender and Teacher Expectations for Students,

Teacher Attitudes Toward the TAAS, and Student Achievement

Gender vs.	N	r	p
Teacher Expectations for Students	22	.038	.866
Teacher Attitudes Toward TAAS	22	.000	.999
Student Achievement	22	-.255	.251

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, performed on the means of respondent age group and the means of the teacher expectations for students, means of teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and means of averaged TLI scores did not show any significant relationships ($p>.05$) between age group and the three variables. The values of $r = -.191$, $r = .038$, and $r = -.280$, respectively, indicated that there is little linear relationship between age group and teacher expectations for students, age group and teacher attitude towards the TAAS, and between age group and student achievement. Table 22 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-moment correlation

between age group and teacher expectations for students, teacher attitude towards TAAS, and student achievement.

TABLE 22

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient

Between Age Group and Teacher Expectations for Students,

Teacher Attitudes Toward the TAAS, and Student Achievement

Age Group and	N	r	p
Teacher Expectations for Students	22	-.191	.393
Teacher Attitudes Toward TAAS	22	.038	.866
Student Achievement	22	-.280	.206

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, performed on the means of respondent grade level assignment and the means of the teacher expectations for students, means of teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and means of averaged TLI scores did not show any significant relationships ($p>.05$) between grade level assignment and the three variables. The values of $r = -.339$, $r = -.244$, and $r = -.140$, respectively, indicated that there is little linear relationship between grade level assignment and teacher expectations for students, grade level assignment and teacher attitude towards the TAAS, and between grade level assignment and student achievement. Table 23 illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-moment correlation between grade level assignment and

teacher expectations for students, teacher attitude towards TAAS, and student achievement.

TABLE 23

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
Between Grade Level Assignment and Teacher
Expectations for Students,
Teacher Attitudes Toward the TAAS, and Student Achievement

Grade Level Assignment and	N	r	p
Teacher Expectations for Students	21	-.339	.133
Teacher Attitudes Toward TAAS	21	-.244	.286
Student Achievement	21	-.140	.544

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, performed on the means of respondent years of teaching experience and the means of the teacher expectations for students, means of teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and means of averaged TLI scores did not show any significant relationships ($p>.05$) between grade level assignment and the three variables. The values of $r = -.235$, $r = .072$, and $r = -.232$, respectively, indicated that there is little linear relationship between years of teaching experience and teacher expectations for students, years of teaching experience and teacher attitude towards the TAAS, and between years of teaching experience and student achievement. Table 24

illustrates the information regarding the Pearson product-moment correlation and the two-tailed probability test between grade level assignment and teacher expectations for students, teacher attitude towards TAAS, and student achievement.

TABLE 24

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
Between Years of Teaching Experience and Teacher
Expectations for Students,
Teacher Attitudes Toward the TAAS, and Student Achievement

Years of Teaching Experience and	N	r	p
Teacher Expectations for Students	22	-.235	.293
Teacher Attitudes Toward TAAS	22	.072	.750
Student Achievement	22	-.232	.298

The statistical procedure of one-way analysis of variance was used to indicate any significant differences in the expectations of teachers for students when grouped by age range, gender, grade level assignment, and years of teaching experience of the respondents. No significant difference ($p<.05$) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected. Table 25 contains information regarding this analysis.

TABLE 25

Analysis of Variance of Teacher Expectations for Students when Grouped by Age Range, Gender, Grade Level, Grade Level Assignment and Years of Teaching Experience

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p
Between Groups	3	58.409	19.470	.290	.832
Within Groups	18	1210.182	67.232		
Totals	21	1268.591			

The statistical procedure of one-way analysis of variance was used to indicate any significant differences in the attitudes of teachers toward the TAAS when grouped by age range, gender, grade level assignment, and years of teaching experience of the respondents. No significant difference ($p>.05$) in the attitudes of teachers toward the TAAS were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected. Table 26 contains information regarding this analysis.

TABLE 26

Analysis of Variance of Attitudes of Teachers Toward the TAAS When Grouped by Age Range, Gender, Grade Level, Grade Level Assignment and Years of Teaching Experience

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p
Between Groups	3	285.182	95.061	.315	.814
Within Groups	18	5434.136	301.896		
Totals	21	5719.318			

The statistical procedure of one-way analysis of variance was used to indicate any significant differences in the average student gains by teacher when grouped by age range, gender, grade level assignment, and years of teaching experience of the respondents. No significant difference ($p>.05$) in the expectations of teachers were found when grouped by these demographics. The null hypothesis should not be rejected. Table 27 contains information regarding this analysis.

TABLE 27

Analysis of Variance of Average Student Gain by Teacher

When Grouped by Age Range, Gender,

Grade Level, Grade Level Assignment and

Years of Teaching Experience

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p
Between Groups	3	11.467	3.822	1.648	.214
Within Groups	18	41.752	2.320		
Totals	21	53.219			

The data collected from the 22 teachers involved in the study were analyzed by demographics, responses to a 44 question survey measuring teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and expectations for students, and measures of student achievement from the Texas Learning Index scores for students in each of the participants' classrooms. The scores from the survey were also analyzed in order to rate each participant in terms of possessing high or low expectations, and positive or negative attitudes toward the TAAS.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to determine whether a relationship existed among teacher expectations, teacher attitudes toward the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS), and student achievement. Three hypotheses were developed: There is no relationship between teacher expectations and student achievement, there is no relationship between teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and student achievement, and there is no relationship between teacher expectations and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS. As part of the search for relationships, demographic information was analyzed to determine if any of the categories were significant in the relationship among the three variables of teacher expectations, teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and student achievement.

A total of 22 teachers from a rural, mid-sized district in grades four, eight, and ten participated in this correlational study. These teachers taught reading and/or math, and were employed by the district for at least two years. The teachers completed a 44 question survey that measured their attitude toward the TAAS test and their expectation level for the students in their classroom. The survey was designed with a five point Likert scale to determine the degree to which the teachers agreed or disagreed with the

statements. Student achievement was measured by averaging the gains in the Texas Learning Index (TLI) for the students who had received instruction in each of the teacher's classrooms, over a period of two years.

The frequency, percent, mean, and standard deviation were used to analyze the responses on the survey for expectations and teacher attitudes toward TAAS. A median score was identified in order to distinguish high expectations from low expectations and positive attitudes toward the TAAS and negative attitudes toward the TAAS. While comparing all three variables, the mean, standard deviation, and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient were determined. Levels of significance were determined at the .05 level.

Post hoc analyses were conducted to determine whether teacher expectations, teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and student achievement were independent of the gender, age range, grade level assignment, and years of teaching experience of the respondents. Frequency, percent, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and analysis of variance were used in these analyses. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Brent, 1999) was used for the Statistical treatment of the data. Selected statistics were interpreted from tables in Applied Statistics for the Behavior Sciences (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1998).

The review of literature focused on teacher expectations and attitudes toward testing in general. Extensive research was found regarding expectations, but the research base for attitudes of teachers toward testing was limited, with no studies found regarding attitudes toward the TAAS.

Most of the research on expectations was conducted in the mid 1970s and 1980s, and the findings have tended to be repetitious. The interactions between student and teacher are influenced by the expectations the teacher develops toward the student. Expectations are formed by teachers in a variety of ways, as are the ways that teachers communicate these expectations to students. The research has found that students react to cues or ways that teachers communicate their expectations, and can either rise to the expectation, whether it is high or low, while developing an internal acceptance of perceived ability. This perception can become a self fulfilling prophecy or a sustaining expectation. Teachers' expectations can impact individual students, groups, classes, and schools.

The research base regarding attitudes of teachers toward testing is not as robust as for expectation effects. Some studies were focused on time spent on preparing students for testing, and effects on instruction or curriculum. Very little research was found on attitudes toward testing processes. Two main issues were identified with state assessment programs (Alkin, 1992; Cannell, 1987). The first, corruptibility or inflation of test scores, found that teachers sometimes teach the test objectives to the exclusion of other curriculum or concepts. Achievement scores have indicated shifts of achievement from omitted subject areas to those that are tested. This may result in teaching to the test, using repetitious drill and practice on the tested areas. Evidence suggests that teachers change curriculum based on tests and concentrate time and effort on test content and format.

The second issue concerns the interpretation of test results (Alkin, 1992). It is questionable to use the same test results for an individual diagnosis of a student as well as

an evaluation of the teacher, campus and district. Heubert and Hauser (1999) found that erroneous causal links between test scores and educational programs can be made, impacting programmatic decisions. The effects on student learning are largely unknown, but the evidence suggests that increasing test scores in themselves do not serve as evidence that students are learning more. High stakes testing seems to have a negative effect on attitudes and work loads of teachers (Stiegelbauer & Lacey,1992; Shanks, 1991), but little is known about the effects on students.

In 1997, the National Center on Educational Outcomes released a report citing that the literature search revealed fewer that 30 studies on attitudes toward testing, five of which focused on persons with disabilities. Their review canvassed published and unpublished research, state sponsored evaluation and research reports, and broad uses of testing for high stakes purposes. Some focused on elementary, some on secondary, and some focused on grade promotion. Results indicate research results on high stakes testing are inconclusive and vary with the type of research questions asked and the types of tests examined. This area of research is limited, and more studies are needed.

No studies were found concerning teacher attitudes toward the TAAS test. Accountability in Texas is headline news and student scores have increased over the years that the TAAS has been in place (TEA, 1998). The scope of the test is increasing over the next five years, yet little research exists on the impact of the test in the classroom.

Analysis

The study revealed that a majority of the teachers in this study viewed TAAS as a benefit to the educational process and that too much time was not spent on teaching basic competency skills. They were ambivalent about graduation and promotion being tied to the TAAS, although they believed a slight relationship exists between TAAS and improved student performance, especially in the areas of math and reading. They did, however, believe that high school diplomas would have more meaning if based on a competency exam. They did not perceive the test as being discriminatory in terms of race or socioeconomics. Overall, the teachers were supportive of competency testing and the TAAS.

The study also revealed that a majority of teachers have high expectations for students to learn while in their classes so that the students are prepared for the next level of education, and feel very responsible for making sure that the students master their basic skills, although they are ambiguous in terms of the impact they have against outside influences that affect students. However, teachers in this study do not have the same level of expectation for all students. They believe students can learn at or above grade level, and convey these expectations via word or action. These teachers feel that they are making good academic progress with their students, but believe that students should be retained in grade level if they do not master the basic skills. All of the teachers encouraged low-achieving students to elaborate on ideas, ask questions, and seek assistance. The teachers were equally divided in terms of removing at-risk students from regular classrooms to better address their needs in more homogeneous groups.

Hypothesis 1

Teachers' expectations for students and student achievement on the TAAS had little, if any, relationship. The null hypothesis was not rejected. When data for all teachers were disaggregated based on demographics, no significant relationships were found between teacher expectations for students based on teacher gender, age group, and years of teaching experience. A very low, negative correlation (-.339) was found between grade level assignment and teacher expectation, although it was not significant. Little, if any, correlations were found between student achievement and teacher gender, age group, grade level assignment and years of teaching experience, none of which were significant.

A higher percentage of the teachers in the study with high expectations were female. The group with the highest percentage possessing high expectations were within the age group of 20 - 29, teaching 4th grade, with 11 - 20 years of teaching experience. Teachers with low expectations for students tended to be male, with the highest percentage rated with low expectations within the age group of 40 - 49, teaching 10th grade, and with 20 or more years of teaching experience.

Hypothesis 2

Teachers' attitudes toward the TAAS and student achievement on the TAAS had little, if any, significant relationship. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Demographically, gender had no correlation to teacher attitude toward the TAAS, while age group, grade level assignment, and years teaching experience had little, if any correlation. None of these were significant. Little, if any, correlations were found

between student achievement and teacher gender, age group, grade level assignment and years of teaching experience, none of which were significant.

The highest percentage of teachers in the study with positive attitudes toward the TAAS were female. The group with the highest percentage of teachers possessing these positive attitudes were between the ages of 20 - 39, teaching either 4th or 10th grade, with 11 - 20 years of teaching experience. Those teachers with the highest percentage of negative attitudes toward the TAAS were male, also between the ages of 20 - 39, teaching 8th grade, with either 2 - 5 years of experience or 20 or more years of teaching experience.

3rd Hypothesis

Teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS had little, if any, correlation. There was no significant relationship. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

In addition to the preceding findings, the ratings of teachers were examined according to expectation level, degree of attitude toward the TAAS, and extent of student achievement. Significant differences were found for all three variables. The seven teachers rated as having the highest expectations for students had scores significantly different ($t = 6.038$) than those teachers rated as having the lowest expectations for students. The five teachers rated as having the most positive attitudes toward the TAAS had significantly higher scores ($t = 7.713$) than those five with the most negative attitudes toward the TAAS. The five teachers having the highest student achievement had significantly different gains ($t = 2.25$) than those five with the least amount of student

achievement. This indicates that the rating of teachers reflects a distinct difference between their expectations, attitudes toward the TAAS, and growth in student achievement.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are offered concerning the analysis of the data and compilation of information collected in the review of literature.

1. It appears that no relationship exists among teacher expectations for students, teacher attitudes toward the TAAS, and student achievement.
2. It appears that teachers support the TAAS and see a relationship between the test and improved student performance, although they are not definite in their level of support in terms of the relationship it holds for student promotion and graduation.
3. It appears that teachers view the TAAS as nondiscriminatory for race and socioeconomic status.
4. It appears that while teacher expectation levels are not the same for all students, most teachers feel responsible for insuring that students learn while they are in the teachers' classrooms.
5. It appears that teachers communicate, via word or action, the expectation that their students can learn at or above grade level.
6. It appears that student achievement on the TAAS is not affected by teacher expectations or teacher attitude toward the TAAS.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. A more comprehensive study should be conducted to increase the sample size. More grade levels, including those in which TAAS is not administered, could be included. The sample could also be expanded to involve more than one district.
2. A related study should be initiated that measures students' perceptions of their teacher's expectations for students and their teacher's attitudes toward the TAAS. These variables could then be compared to student achievement.
3. A related study should be conducted in 2003, when promotion at 3rd grade is determined by a passing score on the reading portion of the TAAS.
4. A longitudinal study should be conducted to determine if teacher expectations for students and teacher attitudes toward the TAAS impact student achievement as students move from grade level to grade level.
5. A related study should be conducted with building level administrators to determine their expectations for their teachers, their attitudes toward the TAAS, and the relationship these variables have on student achievement.
6. A related study should be conducted to determine the learning expectations of parents, their attitude towards the TAAS, and student achievement.

7. A related study should be conducted to assess the effects of the TAAS on the curriculum for both regular and special education students.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

CONSENT DOCUMENT

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Teacher Beliefs and Attitudes Toward the TAAS
Research Project Consent Form

Dear Prospective Participant:

As you are well aware, the TAAS test is becoming more of a high-stakes test throughout the state. Accountability is increasing for students, teachers, campuses and districts as reflected by student scores on this test.

At present, no research has been found concerning how teachers in Texas feel about this test. Therefore, I am conducting a research project that involves teacher attitudes toward the TAAS and teacher beliefs about students.

You have been selected to participate in this study based on your years of teaching in this district, the grade level at which you teach, and the content area in which you teach. By participating in this study, you have an opportunity to contribute to the research base concerning attitudes toward the TAAS and beliefs about students. Upon completion of this study, the results may provide valuable information to you as a participant, as well as to the education community as a whole. There are no known risks associated with your participation in the study, as neither you or the district will be named in the study. I will not even know the identity of the respondent on each survey, as each participant will be provided with a code to use instead of your name.

Your part in this research involves answering a survey based on these topics. Upon completion of the survey, you will have fulfilled your responsibility as a participant. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and I hope that you will seriously consider being a part of this important research.

So that your privacy will be maintained, the Executive Director for Human Resources and Student Services has volunteered to brief you on the survey for the research, and he will assign you a letter code to place on your survey. This is your identification number for the research, and at no time will your identity be revealed. I will not have access to your identification; I will simply tabulate the results and work with them as part of my research.

I would like to thank you for considering to participate, and if you agree to participate, I thank you for the time you have given in completing the survey.

After reading the following regarding consent towards participation, you may choose to participate or decline the opportunity. If you choose to participate, please obtain your letter code from the Executive Director of Human Resources and Student Services and complete the survey. DO NOT PLACE YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY. Please take this letter with you as documentation of the study and your consent for participation.

Respondent Consent

As part of my participation in this study, I agree to complete the following survey and to answer the questions honestly. My participation in this project consists of answering this survey. The information I provide will be kept confidential. I will not be identifiable in any reports or publications. I may choose to withdraw at any time from this study. I may ask questions at any time, before, during, or after the study. My participation in this study will not affect my standing in this district in any way. At my discretion, I may request the results from this study upon its completion.

I understand that this study is being used as dissertation research for Shelley Sweatt, doctoral candidate in Educational Administration at the University of North Texas.

By completing the attached survey, I give my consent to participate in the above study.

I understand that this cover letter is mine to keep as documentation of the research project.

Again, I thank you for your time. If you have any questions concerning this research project, please do not hesitate to contact me. I can be reached by phone at: (w) 569-3326 or (h) 691-1679.

Sincerely,

Shelley Sweatt
Doctoral Candidate, University of North Texas
2628 Shepherd's Glen
Wichita Falls, Texas 76308

Survey of Teachers' Attitudes Toward TAAS

Please use a No. 2 pencil to fill in your responses.

Overview:
Questions 5-24 are general statements on the TAAS competency testing for students.

Definition: TAAS competency testing for the purpose of this questionnaire refers to the mandated paper-and-pencil tests given to students in grades 3 - 8, and the exit level that are used to measure individual mastery of basic academic skills.

Demographics –

1. Age Range:
   A) 20-29 B) 30-39 C) 40-49 D) 50-59 E) over 60

2. Sex:
   A) Male B) Female

3. Grade Level:
   A) Fourth B) Eighth C) Tenth

4. Years experience as teacher:
   A) 0-1 B) 2-5 C) 6-10 D) 11-20 E) Over 20

Instructions:
Please respond to the following statements or questions concerning the TAAS testing by filling in the appropriate response bubble using the following key:

A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly disagree

5. I feel that the TAAS is beneficial to the educational process.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

6. In general, I do not feel that more money should be appropriated for teaching the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics as part of a competency program.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

7. I believe too much time is already devoted to teaching the basic competency skills of reading, writing, and mathematics.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

8. Promotion and high school graduation for all students should be tied to passing TAAS.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

9. Increased emphasis on TAAS competency testing will make schools dull and will decrease their effectiveness.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

10. TAAS testing for promotion and high school graduation is worthwhile, even if it initially results in law suits.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

11. There is no relationship between an emphasis on TAAS competency testing and improved student performance.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

12. If students knew that they had to pass TAAS competency tests to be promoted and to graduate they would work harder and learn more.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

13. Students, in general, do not benefit any more from TAAS which emphasizes basic competency skills than from tests that do not.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

14. I support TAAS testing even if it means my being named as a defendant in a law suit.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

15. I feel that, in general, emphasis on TAAS competency testing on a statewide basis is not warranted.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

16. If a student completes twelve years of school and the required courses for graduation, he/she should be awarded a regular diploma regardless of his/her score on TAAS.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

17. I feel that, in general, the State Board of Education requirement that students pass TAAS for high school graduation will not improve the basic skills level of students in Texas.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

18. I feel that competency-based education programs will improve the reading and/or mathematics skills of a significant number of students in public schools.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

19. I feel that TAAS testing should not be implemented because it is discriminatory toward racial minorities.
   A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

20. Basic competency skills should be a part of the curriculum but should not be allocated additional time and funds in relation to other curriculum offerings.
A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

21. I feel that TAAS testing should not be implemented because it is discriminatory toward students in lower socio-economic categories.
A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

22. I feel that the requirement to pass a competency test for graduation will make high school diplomas on a state-wide basis have more meaning.
A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

23. I feel that, in general, TAAS competency testing is a waste of time and money which could be better used in some other area.
A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

24. As a teacher I support the TAAS competency testing program in my school for all eligible students.
A) Strongly Agree B) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

Survey of Individual Beliefs

Questions 25-44 are general statements on individual beliefs.

Definition: Individual beliefs are those attitudes expressed by an individual teacher regarding the statements on the questionnaire. Individuals should apply the statement to their belief regarding students in their own classroom.

25. Each year, ALL students are expected to learn what is needed in order to be successful at the next level of education.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

26. I believe in the normal curve distribution of achievement based on ability and therefore do not feel responsible for assuring that all students master basic skills.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

27. I do not believe that all children have the ability to learn and to master academic work.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

28. I expect all students to learn at their own highest level.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

29. By word and action, I let the child know that he/she can achieve at or above grade level.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

30. Not all students are held to the same standards
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

31. Typically, 90-100% of the students are expected to master essential skills.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

32. I know how to make academic progress with all of my students.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

33. I feel I am making good academic progress with my students.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

34. The effects on academic achievement of negative influences outside the school cannot be significantly reduced by optimistic teacher expectations.
    A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

35. Expectations for behavior are clearly communicated to students
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

36. Low-income children are less likely to be retained than middle- and high-income children.
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

37. Students who fail to master basic skills are not generally retained, but should be
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

38. I do not demand the same amount of work and effort from low- and high-achieving students.
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

39. I encourage low-achieving students to elaborate on ideas.
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

40. I encourage low-achieving students to ask questions and seek teacher assistance.
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

41. I spend a different amount of time with low- and high-achieving students.
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

42. Some children (other than the mentally handicapped) simply cannot achieve up to the learning levels of their more successful classmates.
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

43. With the exception of the mentally handicapped, all children can learn up to grade level, regardless of family situations or socioeconomic status.
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

44. At-risk students should be removed from regular classrooms and placed in homogeneous groups so that their needs can be better addressed.
A) Strongly AgreeB) Agree C) Undecided D) Disagree E) Strongly Disagree

REFERENCES

Alderman, M.K. (1990, September). Motivation for at-risk students. Educational Leadership, 48, 27 - 30.

Alkin, M. (Ed.). (1992). Encyclopedia of educational research (6th ed., Vols. 1-4). New York: Macmillian.

Allington, R. (1983). The reading instruction provided readers of differing reading ability. Elementary School Journal, 83, 548 - 559.

Ashton, P. (1985). Motivation and the teacher's sense of efficacy. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), Research on Motivation in Education, Vol. II: The Classroom Milieu. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Babad, E. A. (1985). Some correlates of teacher expectancy bias. American Educational Research Journal, 22, 175 - 183.

Badger, D. W. Teacher attitudes toward competency testing for high school students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan). Dissertation Abstract International, 1984, 45/02, 355.

Beckerman, T. & Good, T. (1981). The classroom ration of high- and low aptitude students and its effect on achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 18, 317 - 327.

Brattesani, K., Weinstein, R., & Marshall, H. (1984). Student perceptions of differential teacher treatment as moderators of teacher expectation effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 236 - 247.

Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make A Difference. New York: Praeget.

Brophy, J. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 631 - 661.

Brophy, J., & Emerson, C. (1976). Learning From Teaching: A Developmental Perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 365 - 374.

Brophy, J. & Good, T., (1974) Teacher-student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cannell, J. (1987). Nationally normed elementary achievement testing in America's public schools: How all 50 states are above the national average. Daniels, WV: Friends for Education.

Center on Education Policy (1997). Raising student achievement: Do our actions match our words? Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa International.

Commission on Reading. (1984). Becoming a Nation of Readers. Sponsored by the National Academy of Education, Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Cooper, H. (1979). Pygmalion grows up: A model for teacher expectation communication and performance influence. Review of Educational Research, 49, 389 - 410.

Cooper, H. (1985). Models of teacher expectation communication. In J. Dusek (Ed.), Teacher Expectancies. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cooper, H. & Good, T. (1983). Pygmalion grows up: Studies in the expectation communication process. New York: Longman.

Cooper, H. M. & Tom, D. Y. H. (1984). Teacher expectation research: A review with implications for classroom instruction. Elementary School Journal, 85, 77 - 89.

Cotton, K. (1995). Effective Schooling Practices: A Research Synthesis 1995 Update. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Dusek, J. (Ed.). (1985). Teacher Expectancies. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dweck, C. & Elliott, E. (1983). Achievement motivation. In P. Mussen & E. Hetherington (Eds.), Handbook of Child Psychology, IV: Socialization, Personality, & Social Development. New York: Wiley.

Eccles, J. & Wigfield, A. (1985). Teacher expectations and student motivation. In J. Dusek (Ed.), Teacher Expectancies. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Effective Schools Profiler [Computer Software]. (1998). Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

Elam, S. M. & Rose, L. C. (1995). The 27th annual Phi Delta Kappan/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 77 (1), 41-56.

Fenrow, E. L. Teacher's and elementary teachers' attitudes toward testing related to gains in academic achievement of their pupils (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign). Dissertation Abstract International, 1975, 75/24, 300.

Fuchs, L.S., Fuchs, D., & Phillips, N. (1994). The relation between teachers' beliefs about the importance of good student work habits, teacher planning, and student achievement. The Elementary School Journal, 94, 331 - 345.

Goldenberg, C. (1992). The limits of expectations: A case for case knowledge about teacher expectancy effects. American Educational Research Journal, 29, 517 - 544.

Good, T. L. (1987). Two decades of research on teacher expectations: findings and future directions. Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 32 - 47.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1986). School effects. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1987). Looking in Classrooms (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1997). Looking in Classrooms (7th ed.). New York: Longman.

Good, T. & Weinstein, R (1986). Teacher expectations: A framework for exploring classrooms. In K. Zumwalt (Ed.), Improving Teaching. The 1986 ASCD Yearbook (pp. 63 - 85). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gottfredson, D., Marciniak, E., Birdseye, A., & Gottfredson, G. (1995). Increasing teacher expectations for student achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 88, 155 - 163.

Graham, S. (1984). Teacher feelings and student thoughts: An attributional approach to affect in the classroom. Elementary School Journal, 85, 91 - 104.

Grant, L. & Rothenberg, J. (1986). The social enhancement of ability differences: Teacher-student interactions in first- and second-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 87, 29 - 49.

Gredler, M. E. (1997). Bernard Weiner's attribution theory. Learning and Instruction: Theory into Practice (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Heubert, J. P., & Hauser, R. M. (Eds.). (1999). High stakes: Testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation. Washington, D.C. : National Academy Press.

Hinkle, D., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (1998). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences (4th ed.). New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

Hurwitz, N. & Hurwitz, S. (2000, January). Tests that count: Do high-stakes assessments really improve learning? American School Board Journal, 187 (1), 20-25.

Langdon, C. A. (1997). The fourth Phi Delta Kappa poll of teacher's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 79 (3), 212-220.

Langdon, C. A. (1999). The fifth Phi Delta Kappa poll of teacher's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 80 (8), 611-618.

Langenfeld, K., Thurlow, M., & Scott, D. (1997). High stakes testing for students: Unanswered questions and implications for students with disabilities. (Special Education Programs, Report 26). Washington, D.C.

Leedy, P.D. (1997). Practical Research (6th ed.). New Jersey: Merrill.

Moore, W.P. Relationship among teacher test performance pressures, perceived testing benefits, test preparation strategies and student test performance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas). Dissertation Abstract International, 1991, 53/08, 2782.

Monroe, H.C. Texas educational assessment of minimum skills: A survey of teachers' attitudes in the Beaumont independent school district. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University). Dissertation Abstract International, 1988, 49/06, 1438.

Morine-Dershimer, G. (1982). Pupil perceptions of teacher praise. Elementary School Journal, 82, 421 - 434.

Moses announces new testing program. (1999, September). TEPSA, 56, 5.

National Commission on Testing and Public Policy. (1990). From Gatekeeper to Gateway: Transforming testing in America. Chestnut Hill, MA: Author.

Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., & Brent, D. (1999). Statistical package for the social sciences [Computer Software]. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Omotani, B.J., & Omotani, L. (1996). Expect the best. The Executive Educator, 27, 31.

Peterson, P. & Barger, S. (1984). Attribution theory and teacher expectancy. In J. Dusek (Ed.), Teacher Expectancies (pp. 159 - 184). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Raudenbush, S. W. (1984). Magnitude of teacher expectancy effects on pupil IQ as a function of the credibility of expectancy induction: A synthesis of findings from eighteen experiments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 85 - 97.

Rose, L. C., Gallup, A. M., & Elam, S. M. (1997). The 29th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 79 (1), 41-56.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ross, J. A. (1995). Strategies for enhancing teachers' beliefs in their effectiveness: Research on a school improvement hypothesis. Teachers College Record, 97, 227 - 251.

Saks, J.B. (1995). Building a rainbow. American School Board Journal, 182, 18 - 22.

Shanks, J. (1991). Curriculum Standardization and the Role of Teachers. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Il.

Shupe, J. (1997). Converting theory into practice for academic success. Bulletin, 32 - 38.

Stiegelbauer, S. & Lacey, V. (1992, April). Where We Are, Where We Are Going, and How We Will Get There: North York's Benchmarks Process. Paper presented

at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Fransicso, CA.

Stronge, J.H. The impact of the attitudes of high school principals on minimum competency testing (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama). Dissertation Abstract International, 1984, 44/09, 2648A.

Texas Education Agency (1998). Texas Student Assessment Program: Student Performance Results, 1997 - 1998. Austin, Texas: Author.

Texas Education Agency (1999). Interpreting Assessment Reports. Austin, Texas: Author.

Texas Education Code (2000). Sec. 39.023(c). Texas School Law Bulletin. Austin, Texas: Author.

Texas Education Code (2000). Sec. 39.025. Texas School Law Bulletin. Austin, Texas: Author.

Weber, B.J. & Omotani, L. M. (1994). The power of believing. The Executive Educator, 16, 35 - 38.

Weinstein, R. S. (1976). Reading group membership in first grade: Teacher behaviors and pupil experience over time. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 103 - 116.

Weinstein, R. S. (1983). Student perceptions of schooling. Elementary School Journal, 83, 287- 312.

Weinstein, R. S. (1985). Student mediation of classroom expectancy effects. In J. Dusek (Ed.), Teacher Expectancies.Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weinstein, R. Madison, S., Kuklinski, M. (1995). Raising expectations in schooling: Obstacles and opportunities for change. American Educational Research Journal, 32, 121 - 159.

Weinstein, R., Marshall, H., Brattesani, K., & Middlestadt, S. (1982). Student perceptions of differential teacher treatment in open and traditional classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 678 - 692.